DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 001 SO 005 482

AUTHOR	Arkley, Alfred S.
TITLE	A Study of the Relationship of the Factors of Organizational Climates of Low Socio-Economic Status Elementary Schools to the Political Orientations of Fifth Grade Students. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Michigan State Univ., East Lansing.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Regional Research Program.
BUREAU NO	BR-0-E-064
PUB DATE	Jun 72
GRANT	OEG-5-70-0024-509
NOTE	101p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	*Disadvantaged Youth; *Educational Environment; *Educational Research; Grade 5; Models; Political Attitudes; *Political Socialization; Questionnaires; Racial Factors; Socioeconomic Influences; Student Attitudes; Student Behavior; *Student School Relationship; Student Teacher Relationship; Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

This study proposed to determine how 5th grade students' political orientations result from such social characteristics as their sex, age, socio-economic status and race, and secondly, how student political orientations are influenced by the organization of their school. Emphasis was upon examining the organizational climate in an effort to see if this climate reinforces a belief that these children are merely passive subjects, or if they are active participants in the American political system. One thousand twenty seven fifth-grade students from low socio-economic status elementary schools in urban districts filled out a civic education questionnaire which measured their orientation toward aspects of the American political system, political knowledge, and political behavior. Two hundred sixty-five teachers completed the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ). Control was introduced for the influence of student and teacher, sex, the race of interviewers and students, socio-economic status, and age of student. Findings indicate that the elementary school organizational climate has less relationship to student political behavior and orientations than the school's racial composition. The climate factors Leadership Initiation and Source of Social Cohesion were shown to relate to a teacher role model, and Sense of Organizational Attachment and Administrative Structure to a school role model. (SJM)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

O-E-064

ED 074001

NCERT
SD

FINAL REPORT

Project No. O-E-064

Grant No. OEG-5-70-0024 (509)

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE FACTORS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATES OF LOW SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS TO THE POLITICAL ORIENTATIONS OF 5TH GRADE STUDENTS

Alfred S. Arkley

Michigan State University

East Lansing, Michigan 48823

SD005482

June 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education

National Center for Educational Research and Development

(Regional Research Program)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL REPORT

Project No. O-E-064

Grant No. OEG-5-70-0024 (509)

A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE FACTORS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATES OF LOW SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS TO THE POLITICAL ORIENTATIONS OF 5TH GRADE STUDENTS

Alfred S. Arkley

Michigan State University

East Lansing, Michigan 48823

June 1972

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development.

ABSTRACT

Four organizational climate factors were identified from the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire of A. W. Halpin and D. B. Croft. These factors were identified after Halpin and Croft's original climates did not appear in the OCDQ responses of 265 teachers in 18 inner-city elementary schools in two urban Michigan school districts.

A shortened version of R. D. Hess and J. V. Torney's questionnaire measured 1027 fifth-graders' orientations in the 18 schools toward the political community, regime, and authorities and their political knowledge and behavior. A multivariate analysis tested the relationship between the student political orientations and behavior and the four organizational climate factors, controlling for student socio-economic status, race, and sex, interviewer race, and teacher sex.

The study concluded that the organizational climate factors were weakly related to student political orientations and behavior through two processes of student observational learning, either the teacher or the school serving as the model. Factor II, Leadership Initiation, and III, Source of Social Cohesion, were related to a teacher role model and Factors I, Sense of Organizational Attachment, and IV, Administrative Structure, were related to a school role model. The most important predictor of student political orientations and behavior was school racial composition with all-Black schools having students with participant political orientations and behavior and all-White schools having students with subject political orientations and behavior.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		iii
CHAPTERS		
ONE	INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH PROBLEM	1
TWO	METHODS	9
THREE	THE FOUR ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FACTORS	20
FOUR	TEACHERS AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FACTORS	35
FIVE	STUDENT POLITICAL ORIENTATIONS AND BEHAVIOR	45
SIX	CONCLUSION	63
BIBLIOGRAPHY		67
APPENDIX		
A.	ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE	70
B.	OCDQ QUESTIONS THAT COMPOSE EIGHT SUBTESTS	79
C.	CIVIC EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE	81

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2-1	SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS	10
2-2	SIMPLE CORRELATIONS AMONG THE CONTROL VARIABLES	12
2-3	SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS PERCENTILE SCORES	14
2-4	INDICATORS OF PARENT'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS	15
3-1	THREE-FACTOR VARIMAX ROTATIONAL SOLUTION FOR SUBTEST SCORES BY SCHOOL	24
3-2	FOUR-FACTOR VARIMAX ROTATIONAL SOLUTION FOR SUBTEST SCORES BY SCHOOL	25
3-3	SCHOOL FACTOR SCORES	26
3-4	FACTOR I - DISENGAGEMENT AND ESPRIT	27
4-1	RANK OF THOSE WHO TEACH THE STUDENT TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN	36
4-2	TEACHER CITIZENSHIP INFLUENCE IN FACTOR II CLIMATE AND RACIALLY DIFFERENT CLASSES	38
4-3	RANK OF BENEVOLENCE OF AUTHORITY FIGURES AND INSTITUTIONS	39
4-4	RANK OF INFALLIBILITY OF AUTHORITY FIGURES AND INSTITUTIONS	40
4-5	RANK OF PUNITIVE POWER OF AUTHORITY FIGURES AND INSTITUTIONS	41
4-6	TEACHER INFALLIBILITY IN FACTOR II AND FACTOR III CLIMATES	43
5-1	STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE POLITICAL REGIME	49
5-2	STUDENT PERCEPTION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LAWS	50
5-3	TEACHER BENEVOLENCE IN FACTOR II AND FACTOR IV CLIMATES	55

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH PROBLEM

In this exploratory study I will discuss the contributions of the elementary school organizational climate to student political orientations that are independent of the questionnaire administrator's race, the teacher's sex, and the students' age, race, sex, and socio-economic status. I will discuss two processes of political socialization. First I will discuss how students' political orientations result from such social characteristics as their sex, age, socio-economic status, and race. Second I will discuss how student political orientations are influenced by the organization of the school. This study involved 1027 fifth-grade students and 265 teachers in eighteen low socio-economic status elementary schools in two urban school districts.

Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney have found that an elementary school student's political orientations are partially related to student age and sex. As the student grows older his orientations toward political objects become more specific and conceptually complex. Hess and Torney also state that, "Boys acquire attitudes more rapidly than girls and they are more interested in political matters,"[1] and that students of low socio-economic status participate in less political activity and feel, "less efficacious in dealing with the political system."[2] Edward S. Greenberg has found that black elementary school students hold different political orientations than white children and that lower class children are far less supportive of the political system than those of the middle class.[3] But none of the above studies claim to explain completely elementary school political attitudes. Hess and Torney conclude that, "while it may be argued that the family contributes much to the socialization that goes into basic loyalty to the country, the school gives content, information, and concepts which expand these early feelings of attachment."[4] Greenberg does not speculate about the relationship of the elementary school environment to the political orientations of the students. The four schools he

---

[1]Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children (Chicago: Aldine, 1967), p. 222.

[2]Ibid., p. 224.

[3]Edward S. Greenberg, "Political Socialization to Support of the System: A Compariston of Black and White Children," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1969), chp. 6.

[4]Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, op. cit., p. 217.

investigated were similar in terms of physical appearance and socio-economic environment.[5] He did not attempt to measure the organizational climate of the schools.

Both studies indicate that a student's political orientations vary according to the position he occupies in the social structure. This position initially is largely determined by the social position of the family. The neighborhood in which the family lives usually is congruent with their socio-economic status due to the homogenous nature of most residential areas. The child's first social orientations and behavior patterns replicate those of the adults either in his family or position in the neighborhood. The child's initial socialization tends to replicate the family's social position.

The processes by which these orientations and behaviors are learned have been identified by Hess and Torney as the Identification and Interpersonal Transfer Models.[6] They argue that the child enters the school with a bundle of experiences in interpersonal relationships that have been loaned by the "child's imitation of the behavior of some significant other person -- usually a parent...."[7] The school also can either replace or supplement the family and provide more significant others for the child to imitate. The Interpersonal Transfer Model explains how social orientations learned through the process of imitation are transferred to objects in other social systems. Hess and Torney argue that the school adds to student political orientations through an imitative process and through interpersonal transfer although they do not discuss the relative contribution of each of these processes to the acquisition of political orientations.

The second process of political socialization I will examine sees student political orientations as influenced by the organization of the school. Organization of the school has been classified in at least three ways: first by the formal organizational attributes that do not directly reflect human organizational interactions -- content of curricula, per capita expenditures, number of library books, etc.; second by the social composition of the school -- race, sex, socio-economic status, ethnic group, etc.; and third by interpersonal relations prevailing within the school -- morale, social needs satisfaction, authority patterns, etc.

I have found no studies that discuss the relationship of the per capita expenditures, number of library books, and related data to elementary student political orientations. Many studies of school

---

[5] Edward S. Greenberg, op. cit., pp. 259-261.

[6] Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, op. cit., pp. 19-22.

[7] Ibid., p. 21.

racial segregation have shown that predominantly black schools have lower per capita expenditures.[8] Since these schools do contain students whose political orientations differ from those of students in the more affluent schools one might suppose that increased expenditures might change political orientations. No study has discussed the effect of increased expenditures upon political orientations, although many have shown that increased school expenditures do not affect student achievement.[9]

Another formal organization attribute is the school curriculum. Hess and Torney have reported the political education curriculum is uniform at the elementary school level for white urban schools. They concluded that for all the schools they examined, "compliance to rules and authority is the major focus of civics education in elementary schools."[10] Instead of reporting school by school differences they merely summarized the teacher reports of civic education. Then they summarized all the student political orientations by grade and showed how the school influenced the student because there were changes from grade to grade. Hess and Torney used this procedure apparently because they could not find a relationship between curriculum and student political orientations that occurred at the school level. Edgar Litt had the same problems with the formal curriculum when studying secondary schools, even when he discovered differences in the political content of the school's curricula.[11]

Since the formal attributes of school apparently do differ as do student political orientations, some intervening variable might possibly explain the relationship between the formal school organization and student political orientations. Perceptive teachers in elementary schools have speculated about this relationship and the possible intervening variables. The general conclusion of teachers like Jonathan Kozol,[12] James Herndon,[13] and Herbert Kohl,[14] and John

---

[8] Cf., Kenneth B. Clark, Dark Ghetto (New York: Harper & Row, 1965) and Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in Black and White (New York: Random, 1964).

[9] Cf., James C. Coleman, et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington D. C.: G.P.O., 1966) and U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Schools (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O.,1967).

[10] Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, op. cit., p. 110.

[11] Edgar Litt, "Civic Education, Community Norms, and Political Indoctrination," American Sociological Review 28 (1963): 69-75.

[12] Death At An Early Age (New York: Bantam, 1967).

[13] The Way It Spozed To Be (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968).

[14] 36 Children (New York: New American Library, 1967).

Holt,[15] is that the attitude of the teacher and how well his position is supported by the rest of the faculty are important to what the student learns has been given some strong scientific backing in the research of Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson which showed that the attitudes of the teachers affect the achievement and measured intelligence of low socio-economic status elementary students.[16]

The second explanation of the relationship of the school organization to student political orientations focusses on the social composition of the school. Like the first type of explanations stress family social status, this explanation examines the student's social context in relation to his political orientations and behavior. The school fulfills its role in political socialization by providing a meeting place for the students to socialize each other. At the secondary level there is much evidence that this has much influence but at the elementary level there is little evidence that the peer group influences elementary student political orientations. Hess and Torney conclude that, "participation in peer group organizations within the school or outside it does not have a significant effect upon the socialization process."[17] David Lavin points out that, "elementary school students may not be sufficiently autonomous to develop peer group norms independent of their teachers' attitudes."[18] All this suggests that the adult organization of the elementary school not the peer group organization, strongly effects a student's political orientations.

The impressionistic reports of a ghetto teacher like Jonathan Kozol in Death At An Early Age, and the research of Robert Rosenthal and Lenore Jacobson in Pygmalion in the Classroom, suggest that the elementary school faculty's orientation toward the students is possibly the intervening variable between the socio-economic status of the student and student political orientations. Per capital expenditures, curricula content, and socio-economic composition of the school, all correlate highly with the student's social position and thus cannot predict student political orientations once the student's socio-economic status is determined. So it would appear that orientations towards students by the teachers affects student orientations and behavior.

---

[15] How Children Fail (New York: Delta, 1964) and How Children Learn (New York: Pitman, 1967).

[16] Pygmalion in the Classroom (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968).

[17] Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, op. cit., pp. 218-219.

[18] The Prediction of Academic Performance (New York: Wiley 1965) p. 137.

This leads us to a third way the school can influence student political orientations: through the interaction patterns and norms that occur within the school. Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba define school organization in terms of the patterns of interpersonal relationships between the teacher and the students. They found that the school, so defined, did have an effect upon the political orientations of the students. Respondents who remembered participating in class discussions and debates and who remembered discussing unfair treatment or disagreements with teachers felt more efficacious in politics than did those who remembered no such participation. When Almond and Verba studied the effects of socio-economic status on political orientations they found that low socio-economic status students had fewer participatory experiences and felt politically less efficacious. They also found that having an opportunity to participate within the school raised the political efficacy levels of low socio-economic status students more than those of other students.[19]

Almond and Verba found that students of low socio-economic status were usually not allowed to participate in the decision-making process. This practice created an interaction pattern in which having few chances for participation led to the student's feeling inefficacious concerning political decision-making. When the practice and hence the interaction pattern changed, the student's political orientation also changed.[20] The more usual process of political socialization does not ordinarily result from a specific decision that "We are going to teach low socio-economic status children that they are not to participate in decision-making." Rather it just happens because people act out their social roles. The many studies of American racism and sexism indicate the pervasiveness of this pattern.[21] The effect upon the child is the same: a political orientation is learned.

Each organization encourages interaction patterns and norms enabling the organizational member to achieve both his own goals and those of the organization at the least cost. Thus each organization is like a small society with its own culture that guides the members' behavior and values,[22] a culture which has been named by organizational theorists as "organizational climate."[23]

---

[19]Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba, Civic Culture (Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1963), pp. 352-353.

[20]It is also possible that the interaction pattern precedes the norm.

[21]Cf., Germaine Greer, The Female Eunuch (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971) and Charles E. Silberman, op. cit., "Consciousness raising" is the way the women's liberationists make this process manifest.

[22]Cf., Chris Argyris, Integrating the Individual and the Organization (New York: Wiley, 1964) especially pp. 75-92.

[23]Renato Tagiuri and George H. Litwin (eds.), Organizational Climate (Cambridge: Harvard, 1968) section A.

Andrew W. Halpin and Donald B. Croft developed a questionnaire, the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ), to measure the organizational climate of elementary schools.[24] They identified six organizational climates that they placed on a continuum from Open to Closed. In essence the Open climate was one where authority was shared, communication was open, and a feeling of trust and cooperation prevailed. In the Closed climate the opposite conditions prevailed, and the four other climates -- Autonomous, Controlled, Familiar, and Paternal -- fell in between.[25]

These organizational climates are quite similar to the classifications developed by Chris Argyris and Rensis Likert. Argyris identified four organizational structures that move from Structure I, Pyramidal Structure, to Structure IV, Power According to Inevitable Organizational Responsibilities.[26] The individual in the Pyramidal Structure is dependent and passive and develops a non-participatory political orientation. The person in the fourth structure is independent and realizes both organizational goals and his own goal of self-actualization. The political orientation of such a person is participatory. Likert has developed a similar scheme in which he has identified four management systems, the Exploitive Authoritative, the Benevolent Authoritative, the Consultative, and the Participative Group.[27] Again in the Exploitive Authoritative the employee is passive and has low participation in the decision-making process. At the other end of the continuum the Participative Group the employee is independent and has high participation in the decision-making process.

Argyris and Likert discuss the impact of organization structure upon the behavior and norms of the organizational members. Their schemes of classification imply the organizational climates described above. Halpin and Croft directly measure organizational climate and imply the types of organizational structures described by Argyris and Likert. Since my concern is the child in the organization who observes and interacts with the adults, the concept of organizational climate is the more useful to me because it summarizes the adult interactions and norms in terms of organizational members interacting with clients. In my case the teachers are the organizational members and the students

---

[24] The Organizational Climate of Schools (Washington, D.C.: HEW, Office of Education, CRP-543, July, 1963).

[25] Andrew W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, New York: Macmillan, 1966), pp. 170-181.

[26] Chris Argyris, op. cit., chp. 4.

[27] Rensis Likert, The Human Organization (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967).

are the clients.

The student learns the organizational climate of the school through a process of observational learning described by Albert Bandura.[28] Herbert Hirsch has pointed out how the process Bandura discusses applies to political socialization:

> Bandura feels that "no trial" or "observational" learning is "highly prevalent among homo sapiens, exceedingly efficient and, in cases where errors are dangerous or costly, becomes an indispensable means of transmitting and modifying behavioral repertories..." Observational learning depends upon the learner's being exposed to "real-life models who perform, intentionally or unwittingly, patterns of behavior that may be imitated by others." In observational learning the subject neither makes a response nor gets a reward -- he does not have to manifest any overt behavior. Imitation, for Bandura, does not mean behavior matching. The modeling process, or the process of observational learning starts behavior, but matching does not have to be overt. It simply means that a person will have a tendency to "reproduce the actions, attitudes, or emotional responses exhibited by real-life or symbolized models."[29]

Hirsch used the observational learning model to explain why the family is replaced by other agents such as television and school in his study of Appalachian elementary and secondary school students.[30] In this study I propose that the teacher is an important model for the low socio-economic status student. The organizational climate of the elementary school creates the model that the student perceives when int eracting with the teacher. The political components of the school's organizational climate are then transmitted to the child through the process of observational learning.

Some evidence indicates that low socio-economic students are being socialized into political orientations that predispose them toward subject behavior, i.e., low sense of political efficacy, high

---

[28] Albert Bandura, "Behavior Modification Through Modeling Procedures," in Leonard Krasner and Leonard Ullman (eds.), Research in Behavior Modification (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965).

[29] Herbert Hirsch, Poverty and Politicization (New York: Free Press, 1971), p. 22 The quotations are from Albert Bandura, op. cit., pp. 312-314.

[30] Herbert Hirsch, op. cit., chp. 8.

apathy, and low political activity. Even though the teacher provides a salient model for political learning, Hess and Torney found that, in spite of the children's greater sensitivity to the influence of the school, "children in working class areas of the city are less completely socialized (in the sense of being prepared for political participation) than children from middle class homes."[31] This indicates that the elementary school generates orientations unfavorable to participation in the political system among students of low socio-economic status. What this exploratory study is trying to find out is whether the elementary school organizational climate reinforces a belief in these children that they are merely passive subjects, or are there factors of the school climate that reinforce the belief that the student can be an active participant in the American political system?

---

[31] Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, op. cit., p. 225.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODS

A. RESEARCH DESIGN

The purpose of this research design is to find the independent contributions of the various factors of the elementary school organizational climate by controlling for the influence of the sex of the teacher and student, the race of the interviewer and student, and the socio-economic status and age of the student. Control was introduced in two ways: first, by selecting the elementary schools to be studied and second, statistically by using control variables in a multivariate analysis.

For the reasons explained in Chapter One, the sample of elementary schools was selected so as to contain a large majority of low socio-economic status students. This was done by selecting fourteen "Section 3 Schools," schools receiving State of Michigan financial support to educate culturally and economically deprived children.[1] Four other schools were selected that were very close to being eligible for such aid. A summary of the characteristics of the eighteen schools is shown in Table 2-1. The neighboring environment of the school was controlled in that each was located in the inner-city section of one of two urban school districts located in one of two medium-sized Michigan cities of approximately 150,000 population.

Student age was controlled by having only fifth-grade students answer the Civic Education Questionnaire. The average age of the student respondents was 10.7 years with only slight variation among the schools. All but one sample classroom in the eighteen schools cooperated. A total of forty-four fifth-grade classrooms completed the Civic Education Questionnaire. Thus through sample selection it was possible to control for school socio-economic status and student age.

Control was also introduced by selecting variables to use in the least squares equation when calculating the multiple correlation

---

[1] The criteria that must be met to make a school eligible for receiving section 3 financial aid is explained in section 3 of Act No. 312 of the Public Acts of 1957, as amended, and section 14 of Act No. 287 of the Public Acts of 1964, being sections 388.613 and 388.104 of the Compiled Laws of 1948 of the State of Michigan.

TABLE 2-1

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

School	Percent Non-White Teachers	Percent Non-White Students	Percent Sub-Standard Housing	Mean SES Scores[1]	Percent Male 5th Grade Teachers	Mean 5th Grade Age
1	83.3	97.4	35.1	.6059	66.7	10.6
2	75.0	99.1	11.8	.5763	50.0	10.6
3	80.0	96.8	n.a.[2]	.5300	0	10.5
4	63.6	63.6	18.4	.5696	66.7	10.7
5	46.2	87.5	37.0	.4895	66.7	10.6
6	80.0	98.9	23.7	.4959	0	10.7
7	77.8	91.3	39.6	.5091	50.0	10.7
8	23.5	95.5	45.5	.4224	50.0	10.5
9	0	6.7	47.5	.4466	50.0	10.9
10	31.3	80.8	57.1	.4335	50.0	10.8
11	0	38.7	57.0	.3844	100.0	10.8
12	38.5	94.9	58.7	.4875	66.7	10.6
13	32.1	96.8	55.9	.4288	20.0	10.7
14	10.0	7.0	n.a.	.5168	100.0	10.8
15	33.3	99.2	48.0	.4072	50.0	10.5
16	20.8	76.3	50.5	.5047	33.3	10.7
17	0	2.5	n.a.	.5217	0	10.5
18	15.8	1.1	n.a.	.5057	60.0	10.5

[1]Socio-Economic Status

[2]Not available

coefficient. Five control variables that could meet three conditions were selected. First, the control variable needed to be conceptually related to the dependent variable, i.e. the student political orientation. Second, the control variables needed to be related statistically to variations in the dependent variable. Third, the control variables needed to be independent of each other so that a least squares equation could be used.

Since seven of the thirty-six correlations among the control variables exceeded .30 as shown in Table 2-2, it appeared that I had a small problem concerning independence. So I used the least squares deletion routine to test whether any of the control variables would significantly explain the variations in each of the organizational climate factor scores. The variations of Factor I, Sense of Organizational Attachment, and Factor IV, Administrative Structure, could not be significantly explained by any of the other control variables. Factor II, Leadership Initiation correlated -.53 significant at .025 with the proportion of boys in the class. As the number of boys in the classes increased the organizational climate of the school became more centralized. It is possible that those schools where the number of boys exceeded the girls it was felt necessary to centralize school authority because boys are more likely to threaten it than girls.

Factor III, Source of Social Cohesion correlated -.52 significant at .024. As the socio-economic status of the students rose the teachers began to integrate their teaching goals with their need to belong to a social group. In the school with low socio-economic status students the source of the teachers' social cohesion was not related to their teaching task but instead was related to their need to belong to a group. Within the sample of low socio-economic schools there were schools that were "the bottom of the bottom." The teachers in these schools cooperated together but not to achieve the teaching goals of the State of Michigan but rather to enjoy each other's company. Thus when I find Factor II or III explaining the variance in student political orientations it could also be explained by the sex and socio-economic status of the student. Conversely any explanation by the sex or socio-economic status of the student could also be explained by Factors II or III.

Control variable one was student sex. Each school was assigned a percentage based on the number of boys in the fifth-grade class. Much evidence indicates that elementary school age boys view politics and the political system differently from girls. Fred I. Greenstein found that boys were more political than girls, knowing more political information and more likely to suggest political solutions to societal problems.[2] Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney concluded that, "boys consistently display more active involvement and politicized concern

---

[2]Fred I. Greenstein, Children and Politics (New Haven: Yale U.P., 1965), pp. 115-118.

TABLE 2-2

SIMPLE CORRELATIONS AMONG THE CONTROL VARIABLES

	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	SES of Student	Race of Student	Race of Interviewer	Sex of Student	Sex of Teacher
Factor I	1:00								
Factor II	.00	1.00							
Factor III	.00	.00	1.00						
Factor IV	.00	.00	.00	1.00					
SES of Student	.13	-.07	-.52	-.29	1.00				
Race of Student	.23	-.08	-.01	.45	.16	1.00			
Race of Interviewer	.11	-.17	.27	.09	-.11	.26	1.00		
Sex of Student	-.16	.53	.04	-.16	-.28	-.28	-.41	1.00	
Sex of Teacher	.17	.27	-.20	-.36	-.09	-.32	-.03	.42	1.00

than girls, especially in partisanship and in polarization on political issues."[3]

Control variable two was student race. Each school was assigned a percentage based on the number of Black students in the fifth-grade class. This percentage correlated -.97 with the school student racial proportion, .73 with the teacher racial proportion for the school, and .62 with the teacher racial proportion of the fifth-grade classes. The class student racial proportion control was used because it is the racial measure most directly associated with the student political orientations.

Edward S. Greenberg found much evidence to indicate that Black student political orientations differed from those of White students. He found that "black children seem to arrive at a 'subject' stance toward the political order, as opposed to a 'participant' stance" for White children.[4] Greenberg concluded that "there are tendencies for Negroes and whites to both see and evaluate the political community, the regime, and authority figures differently."[5]

Control variable three was student socio-economic status, SES. This was determined by the response of the student to questions in the Civic Education Questionnaire[6] concerning the occupations of their mother and father. An SES percentile score was assigned to each student on the basis of his responses to questions 28 and 29. Table 2-3 shows the SES percentile score for each occupation. Two SES percentile scores were assigned to each student, one for the father's occupation the other for the mother's. The higher of these two scores was then assigned to the student. Only one score was assigned because some of the children had only one parent.

Table 2-4 shows the rank of the occupation choices contained in questions 28 and 29. Question 28 concerning the mother's occupation had six items of which two do not indicate SES, "She stays home most of the time and has no job" and "I do not know what my Mother or Guardian does." The four remaining items were ranked from low to high SES, then each item was assigned a percentile score derived from the remainder of the sample. The same procedure was applied to question

---

[3] The Development of Political Attitudes in Children (Chicago: Aldine, 1967), p. 194.

[4] Edward S. Greenberg, "Political Socialization to Support of the System: A Comparison of Black and White Children," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1969), p. 228.

[5] Ibid., p. 247.

[6] Cf., Appendix C.

TABLE 2-3

SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS PERCENTILE SCORES[1]

Mother - Question 28

Item Number	N	Percentage of Total	Midpoint	Cumulative Percentage	Socio-Economic Status Score
5.	103	.1580	.0789	.1580	.0790
2.	278	.4264	.2131	.5844	.3712
3.	137	.2101	.1050	.7945	.6894
4.	134	.2055	.1027	1.0000	.8972

Father - Question 29

Item Number	N	Percentage of Total	Midpoint	Cumulative Percentage	Socio-Economic Status Score
7.	34	.0468	.0234	.0468	.0234
1.	401	.5523	.2761	.5991	.3229
2.	135	.1859	.0929	.7850	.6920
3.	77	.1060	.0530	.8911	.8380
4.	24	.0330	.0165	.9242	.9076
5.	41	.0564	.0282	.9807	.9524
6.	14	.0192	.0096	1.0000	.9903

[1]Each student was assigned the highest of the two socio-economic status scores, the school mean was assigned to each school. The socio-economic status score correlated highly with all the categories and is the single best predictor of the variation in Questions 28 and 29.

TABLE 2-4

INDICATORS OF PARENT'S SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Description and SES Rank of Mother's Occupation

Rank (1=low)	Occupation
1.	She is looking for a job.
2.	She works in a factory, laundry, restaurant, hotel, or house as a maid or waitress or some other job where she works with her hands.
3.	She works as a saleslady, clerk, or secretary. She owns a small store. She wears a uniform or nice clothes to work.
4.	She is a teacher, social worker, lawyer, nurse or some job like that. She has a college training for her job.

Description and SES Rank of Father's Occupation

Rank (1=low)	Occupation
1.	He is looking for a job.
2.	He works in a factory or mill, or as a truck driver, janitor, or some other job where he works with his hands.
3.	He works with his hands in a job that takes a long time to learn like a carpenter, an electrician, a plumber, a TV repairman, a machinist, etc.
4.	He works in an office, or store for somebody else. He works as a salesman, clerk, or bookkeeper. He owns a service station, laundry or small store. He is a fireman, soldier, policeman, or works for the government. He usually wears a uniform or a white shirt and tie to work.
5.	He works in an office as a manager or executive.
6.	He is a doctor, lawyer, teacher, engineer or some job like that.
7.	He owns a large business, like a factory or a big store.

29 concerning the father's occupation.

The elementary schools were selected so as to contain a predominance of low socio-economic status students because these students are more sensitive to the influence of the school.[7] However it was still necessary to control for the socio-economic status, variations among the schools because as can be seen from Table 2-1, there were important socio-economic differences among the schools. Fred I. Greenberg concluded that lower socio-economic status elementary school students "show a greater deference toward political leadership; unlike upper-status children they do not begin to display in sixth, seventh, and eighth grades a sense that political choices are theirs to make -- that their judgments are worth acting upon."[8] When Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney studied only white children they concluded that social class differences in political orientations were minimal and measured intelligence could explain the differences better. Their data, however, reveals clearly that even students of low measured intelligence differ according to their social status. Political efficacy interest in government, and political participation are all lower for the low status fifth and sixth grade student who has low measured intelligence.[9] Edward S. Greenberg also found that children of different social classes differed in their perception of the government. Lower class children viewed themselves as subjects of the government while middle class children saw themselves as participants in the government.[10]

Control variable four was the sex of the teacher. Each school was assigned a percentage based on the proportion of male teachers in the fifth-grade classes. I found that when the students ranked the people who taught them the most about being a good citizen, the teacher was ranked above the parents. When I broke down this response by sex I found that the students ranked the mother first, followed by the female teacher, male teacher, and father. The minister, television, and books were ranked much lower. Given the sex-typing that creates different role models for American males and females, I decided to control for the sex of the teacher.[11]

Control variable five was the race of the interviewer. Each

---

[7] Cf. Chapter One explains this point more fully.

[8] Fred I. Greenstein, op. cit., p. 106.

[9] Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, op. cit., pp. 150-1, 153, 155.

[10] Fred I. Greenstein, op. cit., pp. 159, 161.

[11] Germaine Greer, The Female Eunuch (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971).

school was assigned a percentage based upon the number of classes in which a Black man administered the Civic Education Questionnaire. In the rest of the classes the questionnaire was administered by a White man. Each interviewer was assigned an equal proportion of predominantly White and Black classes taught by either a Black or White teacher. I was controlling for a bias in the student response due to the race of the person administering the questionnaire.

William Brick and Lou Harris found a significant difference in questionnaire responses due to the race of the interviewer.[12] Also some psychological testing literature indicates a response bias due to interviewer race.[13]

B. QUESTIONNAIRES

The Civic Education Questionnaire as shown in Appendix C was administered to 1027 fifth-grade students in 44 classrooms in 18 elementary schools during Spring, 1970. The questionnaire was read to the students who circled the appropriate response. The administration time was approximately 45 minutes.

This questionnaire, a shortened version of the one developed by Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, measured five sets of questions relating to the student political self.[14] The first three sets measured student political orientations toward aspects of the American political system: political community, regime, and authorities. The fourth set measures student political knowledge and the fifth student political behavior.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, OCDQ, as shown in Appendix A was completed by 265 teachers in 18 elementary schools. The questionnaire required approximately 20 minutes to complete. The OCDQ contains eight subtests as shown in Appendix B.

---

[12] William Brink and Lou Harris, The Negro Revolution in America (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1964).

[13] Irwin Katz, J. M. Robinson, E. G. Epps, and Patricia Waly, "The Effects of Race of Experimenter and Test Versus Neutral Instructions on Expressions of Hostility," Journal of Social Issues 20 (1964): 54-59.

[14] The Development of Basic Attitudes and Values Toward Government and Citizenship during the Elementary School Years, Part I. Washington, D. C.: HEW, Office of Education, CRP-1078, 1965).

The organizational climate of each school was measured by using the OCDQ developed by Andrew W. Halpin and Donald B. Croft.[15] Using the following method I obtained four factors and a factor score for each school on each factor. First, I calculated an average score for each teacher on each of the eight subtests.[16] Second, using the average teacher scores, I calculated an average score for the school on each of the eight subtests. Third, I normatively standardized the eight subtest scores for the 18 schools using a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10 for each subtest.[17] Fourth, I ipsatively standardized each of the 18 schools' eight subtest scores using a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10 for each school.[18] Normative and ipsative standardization creates a double-centered matrix. When this matrix is factor analyzed each factor identified can be related simultaneously to each individual school and all of the subtests of the OCDQ. Halpin and Croft borrowed this technique from Donald M. Broverman.[19] Fifth, applying a varimax rotational factor analysis to the eight double-standardized subtest scores, I identified four factors of the elementary school's organizational climate. Sixth, for each school a factor score was calculated for each of the four factors. Each factor score indicates at which end of the factor the school is located and how closely the school approaches the end of the factor.[20]

---

[15] The Organizational Climate of Schools, Washington, D. C.: HEW, Office of Education, CRP-543, July, 1962).

[16] OCDQ questions 6, 10, 27, 55, and 65 were scored negatively, Cf., Appendix B.

[17] Normative standardization standardizes one school's subtest score in terms of the mean of all the other schools' score on the same subtest. This method shows how one school's subtest score is related, either high, low, or the same, to the other schools' subtest scores. For a detailed discussion see Donald M. Broverman, "Normative and Ipsative Measurement in Psychology," Psychological Review, 69 (July, 1962): 295-305 and "Effects of Score Transformations in Q and R Factor Analysis Techniques," Psychological Review, 68 (January, 1961), 68-70.

[18] Ipsative standardization standardizes the eight school subtest scores in terms of the mean of those eight subtest scores. This method shows how each of the eight subtest scores are related, either high, low, or the same, to each other. For a detailed discussion see Donald M. Broverman, op. cit.

[19] Cf. Andrew W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration (New York: Macmillan, 1966), pp. 167-168.

[20] R. J. Rummel, Applied Factor Analysis (Evanston: Northwestern U.P., 1970), pp. 150-155.

C. ANALYSIS

The unit of analysis was the elementary school. I used a least squares delete computer program, LSDEL,[21] to assess the contribution of the nine independent school variables to the dependent variable, a student political orientation. The nine independent variables are: the four organizational climate factor scores and the five control variables -- teacher sex, interviewer race, student race, sex, and socio-economic status. The dependent variable is the school average response to a question from the Civic Education Questionnaire.

For each student political orientation the LSDEL computer routine operated the following way: First, a multiple correlation coefficient was computed between the orientation and the nine control variables. Second, the multiple correlation coefficient was tested for significance using an analysis of variance test. Third, for each control variable's contribution to the multiple correlation coefficient a partial correlation coefficient was computed. Fourth, each partial correlation coefficient was tested for significance using an analysis of variance test. Fifth, assuming the deletion of one of the control variables, the percentage of variance explained by the rest of the control variables is calculated. Sixth, the routine stopped if all the partial correlation coefficients were significant at .05 or less. If there were partial correlation coefficients significant at .051 or greater then the control variable with the largest significance was deleted from the least squares equation. The routine was repeated until either all the control variables were deleted or those that remained had partial correlation coefficients that were significant at .05 or less.

---

[21] Mary E. Rafter and William L. Ruble, "Stepwise Deletion of Variables from a Least Squares Equation," (East Lansing: Michigan State University, Agricultural Experiment Station, STAT Series Description No. 8. LSDEL, 1969.)

CHAPTER THREE

THE FOUR ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FACTORS

A. THE CONCEPT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Even though all elementary school teachers are formally required to perform the same task for each grade level due to a common curricula, they differ in the way they interpret this formal task. These differences are apparent when one visits the school and also when one visits the classroom. This research report in using the concept of organizational climate focusses upon differences among schools rather than the differences among classrooms within a school.

Since this exploratory study assumes that the political rule model of the individual teacher and the entire staff results from interactions with the rest of the members of the elementary school, understanding the school's organizational climate is important. In order to understand the model that the teacher or the entire staff displays to the children in the classroom or school one needs to know the organizational setting in which the teacher and staff interact.

An organizational setting can influence the way that individuals perform given tasks as Renato Taiuri points out

> ...climate and many related terms such as environment, situation, conditions, and circumstances have been widely used to explain that a person or a group can behave in very different ways, even when faced with similar tasks and problems.[1]

The concept of organizational climate is especially useful according to Tagiuri "when it is desired to hold the task constant and to express the character of an enduring situation."[2]

The character of an enduring situation can be specified by making qualitative distinctions among similar organizations.

> Quality is defined <u>in terms</u> of a set of variables, e.g., price, workmanship, ingredients, but it is not <u>the set</u> of variables, e.g., price, workmanship, ingredients.

---

[1] Renato Tagiuri and George H. Litwin (eds.) <u>Organizational Climate</u> (Cambridge: Harvard, 1968), p. 11.

[2] <u>Ibid</u>., pp. 22-234.

> It is, rather, a configuration of values of such price, good workmanship, rare ingredients.[3]

This configuration of values Renato Tagiuri calls organizational climate.

> Organizational climate is a relative enduring quality of the internal environment of an organization that (a) is experienced by its members, (b) influences their behavior, and (c) can be described in terms of the values of a particular set of characteristics (or attributes) of the organization.[4]

Chris Argyris in studying a bank for a period of three years used the concept of organizational climate to explain the bank's configuration of formal organizational patterns, personnel personality variables, and informal organizational patterns. He defined organizational climate as, "the homeostatic state of an organization."[5] Argyris predicted the organizational climate would remain stable over time until change occurred in the conditions in which the organization operated and in the values of the personnel. Argyris in later studies has shown how organizational climate influences individual behavior and how the climate may be changed.[6]

Francis G. Cornell, working independently of Argyris, examined four school systems and found that no two were alike in their organizational climate and that these differences were more important in affecting teacher behavior than specific administrative acts related to the daily operation of the organization. Cornell defined organizational climate as, "a delicate blending of interpretations by persons in the organization of their jobs or roles in relationship to others and their interpretations of the roles of others in the organization."[7] Cornell did not relate teacher role interpretations to student role interpretations.

---

[3] Ibid., p. 27.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Chris Argyris, "Some Problems in Conceptualizing Organizational Climate: A Case Study of a Bank," Administrative Science Quarterly 2(1958), p. 516.

[6] Cf., Chris Argyris, Integrating the Individual and the Organization (New York: Wiley, 1964) and Chris Argyris, Intervention Theory and Method (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970).

[7] Francis G. Cornell, "Socially Perceptive Administration," The Phi Delta Kappan 36 (March, 1955), p. 221.

Andrew W. Halpin and Donald B. Croft also viewed organizational climate in terms of the quality of interpersonal interactions in an organization and describe organizational climate similar to the personality of an individual. Their major contribution has been to develop an operational definition of the elementary school organizational climate with the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, OCDQ.[8]

The OCDQ characterizes the organization of an elementary school by measuring teacher and administrator perceptions of their mutual interactions. The OCDQ consists of eight subtests. Four of the subtests measure the teachers' perception of their interaction with other teachers in terms of Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit and Intimacy. The other four subtests for Aloofness, Production Emphases, Thrust, and Consideration, measure teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior. The exact meaning of these eight subtests will be explained later in this chapter when I describe the four factors of the elementary school organizational climate.

Andrew W. Halpin and Donald B. Croft using a varimax rotational factor analysis on the eight subtest scores identified three factors of the elementary school organizational climate. These three factors they called Authenticity, Satisfaction, and Leadership Initiation.[9] After selecting those schools which loaded very high, either positively or negatively, on one of the factors and very low on the other two factors; Halpin and Croft derived six organizational climates defined by a high loading on one of the factors. From Factor I, Authenticity, came the Open and Closed climates; from Factor II, Satisfaction, came the Controlled and Familiar climates, and from Factor III, Leadership Initiation, came the Autonomous and Paternal Climates.[10] The problem of this method is that it uses only one of these three factors to characterize the school and ignores the other two. Examination of the Halpin-Croft data reveals that only one out of the seventy-one schools loaded high on one factor and near zero on the other two.[11] The remaining schools loaded at various levels on all three factors. This procedure discards a great deal of information which may be useful in explaining the influence of the organizational climate on the students.

This may explain why John H. M. Andrews observed that "the overall Climate does not predict anything that the subtests do not predict

---

[8] Andrew W. Halpin and Donald B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools (Washington, D.C.: HEW, Office of Education, CRP-543, July, 1962).

[9] Ibid., pp. 95-102.

[10] Cf., Andrew W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration (New York: Macmillan, 1966), pp. 174-181 for a description of the six organizational climates.

[11] Ibid., pp. 171-173.

better."[12] Andrews concluded that the OCDQ subtests "provide reasonably valid measures of important aspects of the leadership of the school principal in a perspective of interaction with his staff."[13] Allan F. Brown and John H. House observed that of the over 100 studies using the OCDQ most have "uncritically accepted the instrument and the climates in the original form."[14]

Rather than uncritically accept the Halpin-Croft organizational climates as valid I replicated their method on my OCDQ data. My replication did not reveal the same three factors they identified as can be seen in Table 3-1 where the subtests loaded differently. This is not surprising as the Halpin-Croft sample of schools was more White middle class and non-urban than was mine. In replicating the Halpin Croft varimax rotational factor analysis I noticed a fourth factor with eigen value greater than 1.0. Since this was the criterion that Halpin-and Croft had used in selecting factors, I used a four factor solution to the varimax rotational factor analysis. Because the original organizational climates as described by Halpin and Croft did not appear and because using a single dimension to define a school's organizational climate is too limited, I used a four factor description.

As shown in Table 3-2 each of the four factors contains two of the subtests and the four factors account for 83% of the variance in the subtest scores of the eighteen schools. Table 3-3 shows the factor score of each school on each factor. A factor score indicates at which end of the factor dimension the school is located. Table 3-4 shows the relationship between the factor score and the school's subtest score for Factor I. I have not shown this relationship for Factors II, III, and IV because the pattern is the same. Factor I is characterized by a high loading of the subtests Disengagement and Esprit. At one end of Factor I, the subtest Disengagement is positive and Esprit is negative; at the other end the opposite occurs. The factor score indicates where an individual school is located on Factor I in terms of the high loading subtests. As can be seen the Disengagement subtest score is inversely related to the Esprit subtest score. The factor score is also influenced by other subtest scores to the extent that they load on Factor I which in this case was very low. The weight of the other subtest scores will cause the occasional lack of an inverse relationship between the

---

[12] John H. M. Andrews, "Some Validity Studies of the OCDQ," (Paper read at the American Research Association, Chicago, February 10, 1965), p. 37.

[13] Ibid., p. 38.

[14] Alan F. Brown and John H. House, "The Organizational Component in Education," Review of Educational Research, 37 (October, 1967), p. 401.

TABLE 3-1

THREE-FACTOR VARIMAX ROTATIONAL SOLUTION FOR SUBTEST SCORES

BY SCHOOL HALPIN-CROFT N = 71; ARKLEY N = 18

OCDQ Subtest	FACTOR I		FACTOR II		FACTOR III		h^2	
	H-C	A	H-C	A	H-C	A	H-C	A
1. Disengagement	-.86*	.82*	.00	.30	-.33	-.00	.85	.76
2. Hindrance	-.13	.52	.50*	.67*	.34	.21	.38	.76
3. Esprit	.79*	-.73*	-.28	-.12	-.04	.23	.71	.60
4. Intimacy	-.07	-.69*	-.85*	.49	.22	.11	.77	.72
5. Aloofness	.08	.09	-.09	-.00	.80*	-.78*	.66	.61
6. Production Emphasis	-.16	-.00	.76*	.03	.02	-.71*	.61	.50
7. Thrust	.64*	-.04	.08	-.86*	-.47	.32	.64	.85
8. Consideration	.02	-.19	-.07	-.47	-.85*	.67*	.73	.70
							Total Variance	
Percentage of Variance	.23	.25	.21	.22	.23	.22	.67	.69

TABLE 3-2

FOUR-FACTOR VARIMAX ROTATIONAL SOLUTION FOR SUBTEST SCORES

BY SCHOOL N = 18

	FACTORS				
OCDQ Subtest	I	II	III	IV	h^2
1. Disengagement	.91*	.01	.06	.08	.84
2. Hindrance	.50	-.21	.31	-.71*	.89
3. Esprit	-.81*	.13	.06	-.14	.69
4. Intimacy	-.43	.22	.73*	-.09	.77
5. Aloofness	-.05	-.94*	-.13	.07	.91
6. Production Emphasis	.27	-.21	.23	.85*	.90
7. Thrust	-.32	.32	-.81*	.00	.86
8. Consideration	-.23	.79*	-.32	-.02	.78
					Total Variance
Percentage of Variance	.27	.22	.18	.16	.83

TABLE 3-3

SCHOOL FACTOR SCORES

School	FACTOR I	II	III	IV
1	.4493	1.3722	- .9955	.7845
2	-1.4948	- .4058	- .9218	.8068
3	- .7335	.4288	.4370	1.9905
4	.8539	-1.0001	-1.9183	.0071
5	1.5481	- .2992	.8228	.8157
6	- .2219	- .9810	-1.2597	- .1618
7	.8578	-1.2130	.7172	.1370
8	1.2882	1.4722	.1487	- .8611
9	-1.4604	.8665	1.0524	.2808
10	-1.7473	- .5424	.6312	.7396
11	.0551	- .2179	.6099	-1.9608
12	.1205	1.7553	1.2581	- .3185
13	1.5008	.1410	.7314	.6669
14	- .1586	.5556	-1.2235	-1.5159
15	.7271	-1.7375	.2293	.4301
16	-1.1308	- .1102	- .1777	-1.6727
17	- .4270	-1.1693	1.3258	- .8220
18	- .0205	1.0848	-1.4674	.5837

TABLE 3-4

FACTOR I -- DISENGAGEMENT AND ESPRIT

School	Factor Score	Disengagement Score	Esprit Score
5	1.5481	65.5	34.4
13	1.5008	59.6	35.9
8	1.2822	62.9	46.5
7	.8578	57.6	48.2
4	.8539	46.9	36.2
15	.7271	59.1	45.8
1	.4493	51.1	52.3
12	.1205	51.5	43.6
11	.0551	60.4	57.7
18	- .0205	42.8	47.1
14	- .1586	53.1	55.9
6	- .2219	45.8	37.8
17	- .4270	40.0	49.7
3	- .7335	47.0	52.4
16	-1.1308	34.4	55.4
9	-1.4604	42.1	62.5
2	-1.4948	34.5	64.0
10	-1.7473	31.5	61.4

subtests Disengagement and Esprit observed in Table 3-4.[15] The subtests that best define Factor I are those which load highest on Factor I and do not load very high on the other factors. Thus Disengagement and Esprit define Factor I better than the rest of the subtests and the factor score best describes the extremeness of the inverse relationship of the subtests. The further the factor score deviates from zero the more the two subtest scores are deviating from their mean of 50. This same method I used to define the other three factors.

B. FACTOR I - SENSE OF ORGANIZATIONAL ATTACHMENT

Factor I is best defined by the subtests Disengagement and Espirt as shown in Table 3-2. The relationship of the subtests is inverse. A positive factor score means that the teachers perceive Disengagement as very frequently occurring and Esprit as rarely occurring, a negative score means the opposite. Halpin and Croft have defined the subtests as follows:

> Disengagement refers to the teachers' tendency to be "not with it." This dimension describes a group which is "going through the motions," a group that is "not in gear" with respect to the task at hand. It corresponds to the more general concept of anomie as first described by Durkheim. In short this subtest focuses upon the teachers' behavior in task oriented situations.
>
> Esprit refers to "morale." The teachers feel that their social needs are being satisfied, and that they are, at the same time, enjoying a sense of accomplishment in their job.[16]

In a negative factor score school, i.e., frequent Esprit and rare Disengagement, the teachers feel attached to the school. They perceive high morale and much school spirit as frequently occurring. Individually they spend time after school with the students, there is considerable laughter when they gather informally, and they accomplish their work with great vim, vigor and pleasure. They rarely talk about leaving and the school has no small cliques and no isolated permanent minorities. Teachers rarely ask the principal for special favors.[17]

---

[15] R. J. Rummel, Applied Factor Analysis (Evanston: Northwestern U.P., 1970), pp. 152-155.

[16] Andrew W. Halpin and Donald B. Croft, op. cit., p. 40.

[17] Cf., Appendix B for the OCDQ items that define Disengagement and Esprit.

In a positive factor score school, i.e., frequent Disengagement and rare Esprit, teachers feel no attachment to the elementary school organization. Teachers frequently talk about leaving the school system, and the school has a permanent isolated minority and small cliques. Teachers stay by themselves and spend little time after school with students. Morale and school spirit are low and teaching is done with little pleasure.[18]

C. FACTOR II - LEADERSHIP INITIATION

Factor II is best defined by the subtests Aloofness and Consideration as shown in Table 3-2. The relationship of the subtests is inverse. A positive factor score means that the teachers perceive Consideration as very frequently occurring and Aloofness as rarely occurring; a negative score means the opposite. Halpin and Croft have defined these subtests as follows:

> Consideration refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by an inclination to treat the teachers "humanly," to try to do a little something extra for them in human terms.
>
> Aloofness refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized as formal and impersonal. He "goes by the book" and prefers to be guided by rules and policies rather than deal with the teachers in an informal, face-to-face situation. His behavior, in brief, is universal rather than particularistic; nomothetic rather than idiosyncratic. To maintain this style, he keeps himself -- at least "emotionally" -- at a distance from his staff.[19]

The climate that my Factor II identifies is the same as the third factor identified by Halpin and Croft, Leadership Initiation. I have used their name for the factor but have limited the scope of the factor to identifying one part of the school's organizational climate rather than characterizing the whole climate by one factor as they do. Leadership Initiation refers to "the latitude within which the group members can initiate leadership acts."[20]

---

[18] Ibid.

[19] Andrew W. Halpin and Donald B. Croft, op. cit., p. 40.

[20] Andrew W. Halpin, op. cit., p. 192.

A positive factor score, i.e., rare Aloofness and frequent Consideration, means that the school has an organizational climate where teacher latitude to initiate leadership acts is quite rare. Halpin and Croft have called this climate Paternal.

> The principal constrains the emergence of leadership acts from the group and attempts to initiate most of these acts himself. In this instance the leadership skills within the group are not used to supplement the principal's own ability to initiate leadership acts. Consequently some required leadership acts are not even attempted.[21]

In the Paternal school the principal is the "big daddy" who frequently helps teachers solve personal problems, does personal favors for them, stays after school to help them, settles their quarrels for them, and selects courses which they will teach. Formal rules are rarely followed in interpersonal behavior, the faculty meetings seldom have a tight agenda, the teachers frequently question the formal rules but the principal rarely contacts the teachers for advice.[22] This is a school where a benevolent, considerate autocrat rules. In this climate the principal's authority rests upon particularistic norms. Each teacher is dependent upon the principal and thus views this relationship as personal and special. Organizational problems are resolved not in terms of formal procedures but rather through informal special procedures. The role model that the students would observe in such a situation is one of powerful centralized authority figures who will disregard formal rules in response to a personal pleading.

A negative factor score, i.e., frequent Aloofness and rare Consideration, means that the school has an organizational climate where teachers have considerable latitude to initiate leadership acts. Halpin and Croft have termed this climate Autonomous:

> This latitude is wide, but the freedom that this latitude allows is not accompanied by sufficient direction and control from the principal. (In other words, the principal has not defined the structure, or the limits which the members can feel free to attempt leadership acts.)[23]

---

[21] Ibid.

[22] Cf., Appendix B for OCDQ items that define Aloofness and Consideration.

[23] Andrew W. Halpin, op. cit., pp. 191-192.

Teachers have the opportunity to initiate leadership in the Autonomous school because the principal asserts his influence over the school through formal rules rather than informal procedures. The formal rules are rarely questioned and faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda and run in formal ways. However, the principal contacts the teachers daily in a formal manner. The principal rarely helps teachers solve personal problems, settles minor conflicts, or does personal favors for the teachers.[24] The leadership pattern in the Autonomous climate instead of working through individualistic personal relationships with the principal works through universalistic rules that apply equally to all. All teachers are treated as equals and the principal is distant. Potentially the teachers have greater freedom within the classroom.

D. FACTOR III - SOURCE OF ORGANIZATIONAL COHESION

Factor III is best defined by the subtests Intimacy and Thrust as shown in Table 3-2. The relationship of the subtests is inverse. A positive factor score means that the teachers perceive Intimacy as very frequently occurring and Thrust as rarely occurring, a negative score means the opposite. Halpin and Croft have defined the subtests as follows:

> Intimacy refers to the teachers' enjoyment of friendly social relations with each other. This dimension describes a social-needs satisfaction which is not necessarily associated with task-accomplishment.
>
> Thrust refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by his evident effort in trying to "move the organization." "Thrust" behavior is marked not by close supervision, but by the principal's attempt to motivate the teachers through example which he personally sets. Apparently, because he does not ask teachers to give of themselves any more than he is willing to give of himself, his behavior, though starkly task-oriented is nonetheless viewed favorably by the teachers.[25]

The climate factor that Factor III identifies is the degree of integration between the task goals of the school and the need of the teachers to be part of a group. As the Hawthorne experiments in the 1920's indicated it is possible for an organization member to satisfy

---

[24] Cf., Appendix B for the OCDQ items that define Aloofness and Consideration.

[25] Andrew W. Halpin and Donald B. Croft, op. cit., p. 40.

his need to belong to a group independent of the organizational task goals.[26] Frederick Herzberg has suggested that the two are independent in all organizations while Chris Argyris argues that the independence is due to organizational structure.[27] Whether or not these factors are actually independent or just the result of organizational structure is an issue that needs no final settlement here. I believe however that Argyris' position explains the issue more fully. What I am interested in is the effect of the separation or integration of these factors upon the role model that the teachers display to students.

In the school with a positive factor score, i.e., frequent Intimacy and rare Thrust, individual social needs satisfaction is seen by the teachers as independent of task accomplishment. This is a school where "hygienic factors" predominate: it is a pleasant place to spend time.[28] The teachers frequently invite other faculty members to visit them at home, know much about the family background and personal life of the other teachers, and have frequent fun socializing together during school time. The principal rarely presses the teachers about their teaching jobs and rarely tells them of new ideas he has found or sets an example by working hard himself. He is also unconcerned about the personal problems of the teachers as these are handled by the teachers as a group.[29]

In the school with a negative factor score, i.e., rare Intimacy and frequent Thrust, the principal is the source of organizational cohesion. In this climate the principal frequently sets an example by working hard himself. The principal is in constant contact with the teachers, frequently telling them of new ideas, helping them, and using constructive criticism. The cohesion that the principal creates is centered around the task of teaching. Teacher interactions are not very personal. It is rare that teachers invite each other to their homes, know each other's family background, and talk about each other's personal life. There is little fun socializing during school time. This is a climate that is all business and coolly professional.[30]

---

[26] Charles Perrow, Complex Organizations (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1972), chp. 3.

[27] Cf., Frederick Herzberg, Work and the Nature of Man (Cleveland: World, 1966) and Chris Argyris, Integrating the Individual and the Organization (New York: Wiley, 1964).

[28] Frederick Herzberg, op. cit.

[29] Cf., Appendix B for the OCDQ items that define Intimacy and Thrust.

[30] Ibid.

E. FACTOR IV - ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

Factor IV is best defined by the subtests Production Emphasis and Hindrance as shown in Table 3-2. The relationship of the subtests is inverse. A positive factor score means that the teachers perceive Production Emphasis as very frequently occurring and Hindrance as rarely occurring, a negative factor score means the opposite. Halpin and Croft have defined the subtests as follows:

> Production Emphasis refers to behavior by the principal which is characterized by close supervision of the staff. He is highly directive, and plays the role of a "straw boss." His communication tends to go in only one direction, and he is not sensitive to feedback from his staff.
>
> Hindrance refers to the teachers' feeling that the principal burdens them with routine duties, committee demands, and other requirements which the teachers construe as unnecessary busywork. The teachers perceive that the principal is hindering rather than facilitating their work.[31]

Factor IV identifies the organizational structure of the elementary school in terms of role definitions and the locus of decision-making. In my sample of schools, diffuse roles are associated with centralized decision-making and specific roles with decentralized decision-making.

In a school with a positive factor score, i.e., frequent Production Emphasis and rare Hindrance, teachers' roles are not specified by formal rules and procedures. Teachers have few committee assignments, few routine duties, and little burdensome administrative paper work. The principal makes most of the decisions concerning the operation of the school. Frequently the principal makes all the class scheduling decisions and schedules the work of the teachers. The principal frequently checks the subject matter ability of the teachers and makes sure that teachers work to their full capacity. In this school the teachers are controlled by the principal with few specified rules and procedures.[32]

In a school with a negative factor score, i.e., rare Production Emphasis and frequent Hindrance, teachers' rol s are specified by formal rules and procedures. The teachers have many committee requirements, routine duties are seen as interfering with the teaching role,

---

[31] Andrew W. Halpin and Donald B. Croft, op. cit., p. 40.

[32] Cf., Appendix B for the QCDQ items that define Production Emphasis and Hindrance.

and they never seem to have sufficient time to prepare administrative reports such as student progress reports. Yet within this role specific organization, decision-making is decentralized with the principal rarely making all the class scheduling decisions. The principal rarely schedules the work for the teachers. The principal generally leaves the teachers alone. He infrequently checks upon the subject matter ability of the teachers and rarely attempts to see if the teachers are working to full capacity. The teachers are controlled through formal rules and procedures and the principal is personally non-directive.[33]

Rather than speculate about all the possible political role models in each of the four organizational climate factors I decided to first see what student orientations and behavior were statistically related to the factors. As can be seen in the next three chapters I have then attempted to make some tentative conclusions about those organizational climate factors that seem to have political role models that are related to student political orientations and behavior.

---

[33] Ibid.

CHAPTER FOUR

TEACHERS AND ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE FACTORS

One way the student can be influenced by the elementary school's organizational climate factors is through the behavior of their teacher. I have assumed that the elementary school teachers reflect the organizational climate factors in their role behavior and the model that they display before the students. Before I can discuss whether or not particular teacher roles are associated with particular student political orientation, I must determine that the students perceive the teacher as a significant influence on political learning. First, there must be an identification between the teacher and the student at least as strong as that between the parents and the students, for much evidence indicates that parents are important socialization agents.[1] My research as shown in Table 4-1, reveals that the teacher is rated by the students at the same level as their parents in their influence in teaching the student about citizenship.

Second, I must determine if there are any organizational climate factors related to student perceptions of teacher citizenship influence. The least squares deletion routine revealed that only Factor II, Leadership Initiation, and student race could significantly explain the variance in the responses to the question "How much does your teacher teach you about being a good citizen?"[2] The multiple correlation coefficient is .83 with a R^2 of .69. The over-all analysis of variance is significant at < .0005. The partial correlations and their significance levels are:

1. Factor II, Leadership Initiation .61 at .009
2. Proportion of Black Students in Class -.77 at < .0005

Thus in a Factor II organizational climate the teacher is perceived by the students as influential in teaching them to be good citizens. The teacher in an Autonomous climate is perceived by the students as having more influence than the teacher in the Paternal climate. In the Autonomous climate the teacher is able to make more decisions independently of the Principal and power is more decentralized than in the Paternal climate. Also Black students are more sensitive to teacher citizenship influence than White students. So I can conclude that Black students in Autonomous climates are the group

---

[1] Herbert Hirsch, Poverty and Politicization (New York: Free Press, 1971), chp. 4.

[2] Appendix C, Civic Education Questionnaire, question 41.

TABLE 4-1

RANK OF THOSE WHO TEACH THE STUDENT
TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN

"How Much Does the Following Person or Thing Teach You About Being a Good Citizen?"

(1 = Teaches me an awful lot)
(5 = Does not teach me at all)

Rank	Person or Thing	Mean
1	Mother	1.73
2	Teacher	1.86
3	Mother and Father	2.04
4	Father	2.34
5	Minister	2.47
6	Books	2.99
7	Television	3.12
8	Friends	4.25

most influenced by the teacher and White students in Paternal climates are the least influenced as shown in Table 4-2.

The students were asked to be more specific about their perceptions of the teacher's role. They were asked about three dimensions of the teacher's role: benevolence, infallibility and punitive power. As shown in Tables 4-3 and 4-4 the students rated the teacher at the same level as their parents in benevolence and infallibility. But as shown in Table 4-5 the teacher was perceived as having more punitive power than the parents. In terms of role attributes the students perceive the parents and the teachers as similar in terms of affective qualities but as dissimilar in terms of the power of the role occupants. The teacher was perceived as more powerful than the parents.

Four variables were revealed by the least squares deletion routine that could significantly explain the variance in student perception of teacher benevolence. Students were asked to "Think of their teacher as she or he really is...from "Would always want to help me if I needed it" to "Would not usually want to help me if I needed it."[3] The multiple correlation coefficient of the four variables .92 with a R^2 of .84. The over-all analysis of variance is significant at < .0005. The partial correlations and their significance levels are:

1. Factor III, Source of Social Cohesion .71 at .003
2. Socio-economic Status of Student .52 at .045
3. Proportion of Black Students in Class -.85 at <.0005
4. Proportion of Boys in Class .72 at .002

The potential for a teacher to serve as an effective role model is increased when the students perceive the teacher as benevolent. Several factors contribute to a student's perceiving benevolence in a teacher. According to my findings the optimum conditions in low socio-economic status elementary schools exist in those schools where teachers integrate the school task goals and the teachers' need to belong to a group. If this school also contains upper socio-economic status students who are Black and female, such students will be more likely to see their teacher as benevolent. The school with the lowest perception of teacher benevolence would be one where the teachers separate satisfaction of social belonging needs from school task goals. The students would be of lower socio-economic status, White and male.

It would seem that Black, upper socio-economic status females are perceiving their teachers as helpful when the teachers have accepted the task goals of the school. White, lower socio-economic status males have the lowest perception of teacher benevolence when the teachers have not accepted the task goals of the school. When the

---

[3] Ibid., question 44.

TABLE 4-2

TEACHER CITIZENSHIP INFLUENCE
IN FACTOR II CLIMATE AND RACIALLY DIFFERENT CLASSES

"How Much Does Your Teacher Teach
You About Being a Good Citizen?"

(1= She teaches me an awful lot)
(5= She does not teach me at all)

Mean Score

		Racial Proportion of Class	
		Black (40-100%)	Black (0-40%)
Factor II Leadership Initiation	Negative Factor Score (Autonomous)	1.58	2.25
	Positive Factor Score (Paternal)	1.86	2.33

TABLE 4-3

RANK OF BENEVOLENCE OF AUTHORITY FIGURES AND INSTITUTIONS

(1 = Always want to help me if I needed it)
(6 = Would not usually want to help me if I needed it)

Rank	Authority Figure or Institution	Mean
1	Mother	1.47
2	Teacher	2.05
3	Mother and Father	2.07
4	Policeman	2.38
5	Father	2.68
6	Supreme Court	3.21
7	Government	3.51
8	President	3.84

TABLE 4-4

RANK OF INFALLIBILITY OF AUTHORITY FIGURES AND INSTITUTIONS

(1 = Almost never makes mistakes)
(6 = Almost always makes mistakes)

Rank	Authority Figure or Institution	Mean
1	Mother	2.65
2	Supreme Court	2.73
3	Policeman	2.88
4	Government	2.90
5	Teacher	2.90
6	Mother and Father	3.03
7	Father	3.41
8	President	4.20

TABLE 4-5

RANK OF PUNITIVE POWER OF AUTHORITY FIGURES AND INSTITUTIONS

(1 = Can punish anyone)
(6 = Can punish no one)

Rank	Authority Figure or Institution	Mean
1	Supreme Court	3.24
2	Policeman	3.27
3	Government	3.51
4	Teacher	4.00
5	President	4.16
6	Mother	4.68
7	Mother and Father	4.83
8	Father	4.98

teacher presents a role model of accepting the task goals of an organization, the Black female of upper socio-economic status is the most likely to perceive the teacher as helpful. The task goal seems to be that of helping the Black female upper socio-economic status student and of not helping the White male lower socio-economic status student.

The students in all the schools perceive the teacher and the parents as having the same level of infallibility. Students were asked to think of their parents and the teacher as he or she really is. If they thought them to be infallible they responded "Almost never makes mistakes," if fallibile "Almost always makes mistakes."[4] My research as shown in Table 4-4 indicates that the students perceive the teacher and the parents as having the same level of infallibility. A role model believed to make few mistakes is one more likely to be imitated.

The least squares deletion routine revealed that two organizational climate factors are related to student perceptions of teacher infallibility, Factor III, Leadership Initiation and Factor III, Source of Social Cohesion. The multiple correlation coefficient of these two factors is .66 with a R^2 of .44. The over-all analysis of variance is significant at .013. The partial correlations and their significance levels are:

1. Factor II, Leadership Initiation .51 at .036
2. Factor III, Source of Social Cohesion .55 at .023

Table 4-6 indicates that in a Paternal climate school where need to belong to a social group is independent of the school task goals, the students perceive their teachers as making many mistakes. In an Autonomous climate where group belonging needs are integrated with organizational task goals, the students perceive their teachers as making few mistakes. Here we have some evidence that the organizational climate is related to the teacher model that the student observes. In the Paternal and non-integrated climate the teachers probably make many mistakes in terms of the school because he has not integrated the school task goals into his own behavior. Also, because of this low integration the Principal needs constantly to supervise the teachers, though in a personal way since the rules of the school are not seen as relevant.

The students in all the schools perceive the teacher as having more punitive power than their parents as shown in Table 4-5. Students were asked to think of their parents and teacher as he or she really is. If they perceived them high in punitive power they marked "Can punish anyone." If the student perceived little punitive power they marked

---

[4] Ibid., questions 16, 45, and 70.

TABLE 4-6

TEACHER INFALLIBILITY
IN FACTOR II AND FACTOR III CLIMATES

"Think of Your Teacher as He Really Is..."

(1 = Almost never makes mistakes)
(6 = Almost always makes mistakes)

Mean Score

FACTOR II, Leadership Initiation

		Positive Factor Score (Paternal)	Negative Factor Score (Autonomous)
Factor III Source of Social Cohesion	Positive Factor Score (Non-integrated)	3.08	2.96
	Negative Factor Score (Integrated)	2.93	2.67

"Can punish no one."[5] These findings confirm that the student in low socio-economic status schools are more sensitive to the influence of the school, as I discussed in Chapter One. However no organizational climate factor significantly explained the variance in student perceptions of the teacher's punitive power.

One can assume that the organizational climate influences teacher behavior which in turn creates a model that the students observe. Using this approach, the only Factor II, Leadership Initiation and Factor III, Source of Social Cohesion can be considered as climates which would have a potential influence upon student political orientations.

---

[5] Ibid., questions 17, 46, and 71.

CHAPTER FIVE

STUDENT POLITICAL ORIENTATIONS AND BEHAVIOR

A. INTRODUCTION

The political orientations and behaviors that the elementary school student acquires will define his "political self." This concept, adapted by Richard E. Dawson and Kenneth Prewitt from George H. Mead's notion of the "social self," according to Dawson and Prewitt refers to the individual's "entire complex of orientations regarding his political world, including his views toward his own political role."[1] Through a process of political socialization every individual acquires a political self in which he "acquires a complex of beliefs, feeling, and information which help him to comprehend, evaluate, and relate to the political world around him."[2]

Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba have identified three types of political selves: parochial, subject, and participant.[3] They were able to relate subject and participant orientations to school authority patterns as discussed in Chapter One. Edward S. Greenburg very tentatively concluded that elementary student political orientations, "would appear to point to a kind of 'participant' orientation among white students and 'subject' orientation among black students."[4]

Having a subject political orientation means the individual views himself as a passive member of the political system, one who accepts all decisions as legitimate and never attempts to influence those who make the authoritative decisions for the entire society. An individual with a participant political orientation views himself as an active member of the political system. This person does not

---

[1] Richard E. Dawson and Kenneth Prewitt, Political Socialization (Boston: Little, Brown, 1969), p. 17.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba, The Civic Culture (Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1963), pp. 11-20.

[4] Edward S. Greenberg, "Political Socialization to Support of the System: A Comparison of Black and White Children," (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1969), p. 128.

accept all decisions as legitimate and makes many attempts to influence those who make the authoritative decisions for the entire society.

The Civic Education Questionnaire measures five sets of student political orientations. Sets one, two, and three measure orientations toward the American political system, community, regime, and authorities. Set four measures student political knowledge. Set five measures student political behavior. All the responses to these five sets can be classified as either a subject or participant orientation. If the school organizational climate factor is related to student political orientations, I would expect that the climates in which the teachers were subjects in their own school organization would create either a subject or participant model which the students would observe and transfer to political objects. This model could be either the individual teacher or the entire school. Factor I, Sense of Organizational Attachment, and Factor IV, Administrative Structure, were related to individual teacher models; while Factor II, Leadership Initiation, and Factor III, Source of Social Cohesion, were related to school models.

B. SET ONE - POLITICAL COMMUNITY

David Easton and Robert D. Hess defined the political community as, "the members of a society looked upon as a group of persons who seek to solve their problems in common through shared political structure."[5] The relationship of the child's attachment to the political community to subject and participant political orientations has never been directly examined. However those students who will eventually become participants in the political process seem to have greater attachment, while those who will eventually become subjects in the political process seem to have less attachment. The Hess-Torney study found much higher and more persistent sense of attachment to the political community when examining predominantly white middle to upper socio-economic status students.[6] The Hirsch and Greenberg studies of low socio-economic status students, both White and Black, found lower and less stable attachment to the political community.[7]

---

[5]David Easton and Robert D. Hess, "The Child's Political World," Midwest Journal of Political Science 6 (August, 1962), p. 233.

[6]Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, The Development of Political Attitudes in Children (Chicago: Aldine, 1967), chps. 2, 3, Appendix B.

[7]Herbert Hirsch, Poverty and Politicization (New York: Free Press, 1971), and Edward S. Greenberg, op. cit.

In my study the four organizational climate factors were not significantly related to student attachment to the political community as indicated by responses to the question, "America is the best country in the world."[8] The least squares deletion revealed that only the student racial proportion of the classroom could significantly account for the differences among the schools. The correlation coefficient was .57 explaining 33% of the variance with a significance of .013. As the proportion of Black students increased in the class, the more negative the response to the question, "America is the best country in the world." Socio-economic status was not significantly related to the student responses. My finding would support Greenberg's that Black student attachment to the political community was lower than White by the fifth-grade.[9]

I have concluded that school organizational climate does not affect the student's attachment to the political community but that the racial composition of the school does. Racial segregation has different effects depending on the segregated race. Black segregation is associated with a low feeling of attachment to the political community, while White segregation is associated with a high feeling of political attachment.

C. SET TWO - POLITICAL REGIME

According to Easton and Hess the political regime is:

> The slower changing formal and informal structures through which the decisions (of the political authorities) are taken and administered, together with the rules of the game or codes of behavior that legitimate the actions of political authorities and specify what is expected of citizens or subjects.[10]

A participation orientation to the political regime would perceive political structure and the related norms as allowing much citizen involvement in the decision-making process. A participant would also perceive rules and laws as flexible and would believe that individuals can influence the decision-making process, i.e., a sense of political efficacy. A subject orientation would be the opposite.

---

[8] Appendix C, Civic Education Questionnaire, question 5.

[9] Edward S. Greenberg, op. cit., pp. 107-110.

[10] David Easton and Robert D. Hess, op. cit., p. 233.

Factor I, Sense of Organizational Attachment, was the only organizational climate factor that showed a consistent but weak relationship with the questions dealing with summary evaluations of the political regime. In both cases the greater the teacher's sense of attachment to the elementary school the greater the student attachment to the political regime.

Factor I and student socio-economic status best explained the variance in the question, "I think what goes on in the government is all for the best."[11] The multiple correlation coefficient was .57 explaining 33% of the variance with an over-all significance of .051. The partial correlations and their significance levels are:

1.	Factor I, Sense of Organizational Attachment	.50 at .041
2.	Student Socio-Economic Status	.42 at .091

Thus in the schools where the teachers' sense of attachment to the school was high and where there was a predominance of low socio-economic status students I found the highest summary evaluation of the political regime as shown in Table 5-1. The low socio-economic status students are more sensitive to the organizational climate of the schools and thus they are most influenced by the school model that they observe.

A similar but weaker relationship concerning Factor I was also found in the responses to the question, "All laws are fair."[12] The partial correlation of Factor I to the question was .09 significant at .77. Again where teachers' sense of attachment to the school was high the students perceived laws as being fair, another indicator of regime attachment. When the students observe teachers who are attached to the school organization, they seem to pick this up and transfer it to the political regime. However Factor I was the only factor that had even a weak relationship to student political orientations.

The two best predictors of the school differences in the student orientations to the political regime were the class racial proportions and the sex of the classroom teacher. The multiple correlation coefficient for student perception of the effectiveness of laws, whether "people who break laws get caught or get away,"[13] was .88 explaining 77% of the school variance with a significance of <.0005. The independent effects of class racial proportions and sex of teacher will be discussed below. However as seen in Table 5-2 it is apparent

---

[11] Appendix C, Civic Education Questionnaire, question 18.

[12] Ibid., question 49.

[13] Ibid., question 21.

TABLE 5-1

STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE POLITICAL REGIME

"I think what goes on in the government is all for the best)

(1 = Yes!! Yes!!)
(5 = No!! No!!)

Mean Score

		School Socio-Economic Status	
		Low (SES Score .38-.49)	High (SES Score .51-.61)
Factor I, Sense of Organizational Attachment	High (Negative Factor Score)	2.59	2.69
	Low (Positive Factor Score)	2.82	2.96

TABLE 5-2

STUDENT PERCEPTION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF LAWS

"What do you think is the most true?"

(1 = People who break laws always get caught)
(4 = People who break laws always get away)

Mean Score

		Sex of Fifth Grade Teachers	
		Female (67-100%)	Male (67-100%)
Racial Proportion of Class	Black (40-100%)	2.25	2.60
	Black (0-40%)	1.68	2.00

that the students in the predominantly Black schools with male teachers perceive the laws of the regime as ineffective and those in the predominantly White schools with female teachers see the laws as effective.

The greater the number of Black students the lower was attachment to the political regime. Black students thought it was true that "people who break laws usually or always got away," with a partial correlation of .87 with a significance of < .0005. They also believed that disobeying their parents was worse than disobeying the teacher or a policeman,[14] with correlation coefficient of -.72 with a significance of .001. White students perceive political regime attachment in the opposite direction.

When the proportion of white students increases a subject orientation appears in a feeling that all laws are enforced and that disobedience of non-family authority figures is bad. The predominantly Black classes seem to have some participant orientation in terms of a realization that all laws are not enforced and thus the regime is apparently sensitive to some pressures that result in differing policy responses. However Black students' feeling that the worst disobedience is failure to obey one's parents indicates a lack of attachment to the political regime. This lack of attachment plus the low regard for the efficiency of the legal system indicates possibly the growth of political cynicism, a different kind of subject orientation in that it has the potential for political activism.

The sex of the teacher also predicted the school variance in responses to two questions relating to an evaluation of the performance of the political regime. The questions tapped perceptions of fairness of laws and whether or not people who broke the laws got caught. The sex of the classroom teacher was the only variable that explained school differences in perceptions of the fairness of laws,[15] a correlation coefficient of -.49 significant at .049. The sex of the classroom teacher also explained along with the class racial proportion student perceptions of the effectiveness of laws,[16] a partial correlation coefficient of .52 significant at .031. The male teachers seem to be teaching a subject orientation in that the students in their classes perceive laws as fair but that people who break these fair laws get away. The female teacher's students seem to have a more participant orientation seeing laws as unfair and people being caught. All that I can conclude here is that the teachers differ in orientations

---

[14] Ibid., question 20.

[15] Ibid., question 49.

[16] Ibid., question 21.

according to sex and this is being transferred to political objects. But until a closer analysis of male and female teachers is done, this is merely speculation.

The students were also asked questions about the political efficacy,[17] the meaning of democracy,[18] the permanence of law,[19] and how they would respond to a policeman who was doing something wrong,[20] but none of the control variables nor the organizational climate factors could explain the differences among the schools.

My finding indicates that as student orientations toward the political regime become more conceptually abstract the effect of the school becomes less. School organizational climate factors and school related factors such as racial proportion and the sex of the teacher could explain school differences only for relatively simple orientations toward the political regime. Yet for political efficacy, the meaning of democracy, the permanence of law, and response to a policeman who was doing something wrong, no school factor could explain the differences. It is possible that these orientations will develop later in age, or it is possible that these orientations are the result of the low socio-economic status environment of the entire sample and that the differences I am measuring are trivial.

D. SET THREE - POLITICAL AUTHORITIES

According to Easton and Hess the political authorities are "the occupants of those roles through which the day-to-day formulation and administration of binding decisions for a society are undertaken."[21] The political authorities represent the current government. The students were asked about the authorities seen as persons, like the President and the policeman, and about authorities seen as institutions, like the Supreme Court and the Government. Organizational climate factors are related to student perceptions of personal school authority, the teacher. Factor II, Leadership Initiation, and Factor III, Source of Social Cohesion, are related to student perceptions of teacher benevolence and infallibility as explained in Chapter Four. If

---

[17] Ibid., questions 12, 30, 31, 72, and 73.

[18] Ibid., questions 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, and 60.

[19] Ibid., question 11.

[20] Ibid., question 64.

[21] David Easton and Robert D. Hess, op. cit., p. 233.

interpersonal transfer is occurring then I would expect these role attributes to be transferred to political authorities, most likely the personal ones because they resemble the teacher, less likely the institutional authorities. Factor I, Sense of Organizational Attachment, and Factor IV, Administrative Structure, would most likely be related to institutional political authorities because they are associated with school role models.

1. Benevolence

Authority figure benevolence was measured by asking the student to think of an authority figure, either a person or an institution, as it really is and how much it would help them if they really needed it.[22] Students perceived their teacher as most helpful in a climate where the teachers had integrated their need to belong to a group with the job of teaching. But this feeling of benevolence was not transferred to political authorities. Although all the correlation coefficients were in the predicted direction not one significantly explained the school differences. Thus I would conclude that although Factor III, Source of Social Cohesion, will predict how students perceive teacher benevolence, this perception is only very weakly transferred to political objects.

For orientations toward the President and Government no control variable nor organizational climate factor explained the school differences. Only class racial proportion explained student perceptions of policeman benevolence with a correlation coefficient of .61 significant at .007. As the number of Black students increased the perception of the policeman's benevolence increased.

Edward S. Greenberg found that low socio-economic status children see the policeman as the representative of the political systems while higher socio-economic status children see the President in that role. Greenberg found that the low socio-economic status child, although more afraid of the political system, attributes the highest benevolence to the policeman, an authority who represents the political system.[23] Thus it would appear that the Black students in my study, rate the policeman high in benevolence because they fear this symbol of the American government: they feel vulnerable.

In analyzing the meaning of a high benevolence rating, it is difficult to separate those perceptions in which the child is saying, "This authority figure really wants to help me," and those where the child is saying, "I am scared and I hope he will help me." In the

---

[22] Appendix C, Civic Education Questionnaire, questions 8, 15, 32, 44, 52, 61, and 69.

[23] Edward S. Greenberg, op. cit., pp. 211-219.

case of the teacher I think the child sees the benevolence as the former because the child rates the parents at the same level of benevolence. In the case of the policeman, I would agree with David Easton and Robert D. Hess that:

> Confronted with the pervasive and inescapable authority of adults, and realistically aware of his own helplessness and vulnerability, the child must seek some congenial form of accommodation. . . By idealizing authority and by actually seeing it as benign, soliticious and wise, the child is able to allay the fears and anxieties awakened by his own dependent state. A potentially threatening figure is conveniently transformed into a protector.[24]

Because of the two possible meanings of benevolence to the child I would expect the children who perceive a teacher to be benevolent to be less likely to rate political authorities as benevolent. An examination of my data found this to be true for the President and the policeman who are both negatively correlated with teacher and parent benevolence. But it is not true for the Supreme Court and the Government which are positively correlated. I would conclude that low socio-economic status students perceive the President and policeman as threatening and the Supreme Court and government as not. This may also indicate that these students are perceiving only personal authority figures but not institutional authority figures as threatening.

Perceptions of Supreme Court benevolence were explained by three variables as revealed by the least squares deletion routine. The multiple correlation coefficient is .67 explaining 45% of the variance with a significance of .034. The partial correlations and their levels of significance are:

1.	Factor II, Leadership Initiative	.53 at .037
2.	Factor IV, Administrative Structure	-.54 at .032
3.	Proportion of Boys in Class	-.56 at .025

The relationship between Factor II and Factor IV is that when the teachers are decentralized in their teaching function and centralized in the support functions, the students perceive the Supreme Court as benevolent. The teacher is most likely to be perceived as benevolent in this climate as shown in Table 5-3, so there seems to be a transfer to the Supreme Court. However when the teachers are centralized in their teaching, they probably have to follow a common curricula, and the school is administratively decentralized the students perceive the Supreme Court as less benevolent. The teacher is seen as less benevolent in this climate as shown in Table 5-3. Thus it would appear that teacher benevolence is only transferred to institutional political objects.

---

[24] David Easton and Robert D. Hess, op. cit., p. 243.

TABLE 5-3

TEACHER BENEVOLENCE
IN FACTOR II and IV CLIMATES

"Think of Your Teacher As She Really is..."

(1 = Would always want to help me if I needed it)
(6 = Would not usually want to help me if I needed it)

Mean Score

		Factor II, Leadership Initiation	
		Negative Factor Score (Autonomous)	Positive Factor Score (Paternal)
Factor IV Administrative Structure	Positive Factor Score (Personal Control)	1.65	2.32
	Negative Factor Score (Rule Control)	2.30	2.22

2. Infallibility

Although Factor II, Leadership Initiation and Factor III, Source of Social Cohesion could predict student perceptions of teacher infallibility, i.e., the possibility of making mistakes, neither of these factors were associated with student perceptions of political authority infallibility. Instead the racial composition of the class predicted the school differences. As the proportion of Black students in the class increased the feeling increased that the President, Supreme Court, policeman, and government made mistakes.[25] The correlation coefficients and their significance levels were as follows:

1.	President	.63 at .005
2.	Supreme Court	.53 at .016
3.	Policeman	.76 at < .0005
4.	Government	.45 at .058

There was no relationship between the racial composition of the class and perceptions of teacher infallibility. Thus how the children perceived the teacher had no bearing on ho they perceived political authorities: no observational learning nor interpersonal transfer is occurring. Instead I found that Black children saw the political authorities as making many mistakes and White children saw them as making few mistakes.

3. Punitive Power

The punitive power of political authorities was measured by asking the students about the number of people that the authority could punish, from no one to anyone. If observational learning was occurring one would expect that in those schools where the punitive power of the teacher was perceived as great this perception would be transferred to the political authorities. In no school were student perceptions of the teacher's punitive power explained by the school's organizational climate factors or the control variables. Thus there was no possibility for interpersonal transfer to occur.

The correlation coefficients, only one of which is significant, showed a weak relationship between Factor IV, Administrative Structure to student perceptions of the punitive power of the President, Supreme Court, policeman, and government.[26] The correlation coefficients and the levels of significance are as follows:

---

[25] Appendix C, Civic Education Questionnaire, questions 9, 33, 53, and 62.

[26] Ibid., questions 10, 34, 54, and 63.

1.	President	.32 at .250
2.	Policeman	.28 at .282
3.	Government	.05 at .887
4.	Supreme Court	.57 at .021

The school where the principal was the boss was the school where political authorities were seen as having the ability to punish anyone. In the school where the authority of the principal was decentralized, political authorities were seen as having less punitive power. This relationship was the strongest for the Supreme Court. Apparently what is happening here is that the students are observing the entire school as a model. The centralized model is seen as having great punitive power, possibly because the principal makes all the administrative decisions. The basis for authority is not rule-based but personally based. Punitive power apparently is being perceived as based upon personal attributes rather than formal rules. The decentralized model is seen as having less punitive power because the principal is not personally involved in the control of the organization, formal rules guide behavior. Thus rule-breaking is defined in impersonal terms and probably not perceived as personal punishment.

Given the strong affective relationships that arise between teacher and student, any attempt by the teacher to enforce rules will probably be viewed by the student as personal punishment. But the school which uses formal rules probably reduces this feeling. Students who are in an organizational climate that uses formal rules for organizational control perceive political authorities as having less punitive power, while those in schools where organizational control is informal see all political authorities as having great punitive power, even the Supreme Court which epitomizes formal rule-making.

The racial proportion in the class explained best the student perceptions of the punitive power of the Supreme Court, policeman, and government. No organizational climate factor or control variable significantly explained the President's perceived punitive power. The correlation coefficients and the levels of significance are reported below:

1.	President	.10 at .745
2.	Policeman	.47 at .047
3.	Government	.49 at .037
4.	Supreme Court	.63 at .010

The greater the proportion of Black students in the class the lower the perception of political authority's punitive power.

The student's perceptions of the role attributes of political authorities resulted primarily from the student's race, with Black students seeing political authorities as more benevolent but more fallible and punitively weaker than White students. This combination

of orientations indicates that the Black students may be taking a participant stance toward the political system. Although the high benevolence indicates that the students feel vulnerable as Easton and Hess point out,[27] they apparently do not feel helpless about it as the low infallibility and punitive power ratings indicate. The White students' low benevolence rating indicates they do not feel vulnerable, but they do rate political authority high on infallibility and punitive power. This would indicate the possibility of a subject stance because authority is evaluated as being non-threatening and powerful.

E. SET FOUR - POLITICAL KNOWLEDGE

The political knowledge questions measured the salience of politics to the student and his information concerning political parties. Those students with a participant orientation would have a high-interest in politics and would see party politics as relevant and important. Those with a subject orientation would have a low interest in politics and would not see party politics as important or relevant.

As shown in Chapter Four, Factor II, Leadership Initiation, was related to how much influence the teacher had upon the student's citizenship training. In the Autonomous climate where the teacher was able to make many decisions independently of the principal, the students reported their teacher as having much influence concerning citizenship training. While in the Paternal climate where the principal made all the decisions and the teachers obeyed, the students perceived their teachers as having little citizenship influence. The teacher in Autonomous climate is more a participant in the school organization while the teacher is more a subject in the Paternal climate.

The subject and participant teacher models apparently are observed by the students who transfer them in terms of subject and participant political orientations. The students in the Paternal climate showed a subject orientation by reporting that politics was not very salient to them as compared to a higher salience by the more participant oriented students in the Autonomous climate. The salience of politics was measured by asking the students, "How much are you interested in reading or talking about current events, government, or other things going on in our country?"[28] Factor II, Leadership Initiation and Factor IV, Administrative Structure had a multiple

---

[27] David Easton and Robert D. Hess, op. cit., p. 243.

[28] Appendix C, Civic Education Questionnaire, question 19.

correlation coefficient of .64 explaining 41% of the variance significant at .019. The partial correlations and the levels of significance are as follows:

1. Factor II, Leadership Initiation .52 at .032
2. Factor IV, Administrative Structure -.49 at .044

Factor IV, Administrative Structure, also explained student perceptions concerning the salience of politics. However the factor was not related to student perceptions of the teacher's citizenship influence or role attributes, so apparently the students were observing the entire school as a model as they did in their perceptions of the Supreme Court's punitive power. In the school where the principal personally made all the administrative decisions in an informal way the students perceived politics as very salient. Here the school is possibly viewed as a participant in the school district where it as personified by the principal is able to make many decisions specially adapted to its own needs. In the school where administrative problems are decided by formal rules the principal is not perceived as being in charge but rather as merely carrying out orders. Thus the school could be viewed as a subject in the school district, the students then transfer this model to politics by seeing politics as not very salient.

The factor climates that explain a high salience of politics seem to be in contradiction, for how can the teachers be autonomous in their leadership acts and yet have a principal who makes all the administrative decisions? What happens here is that the teachers are autonomous concerning their subject matter decisions and are centralized in terms of coordination of their teaching activities. No one tells them what to do in the library but the principal does tell them when they can use the library.

Factor IV, Administrative Structure, not only significantly explained student perceptions of the salience of politics but also the importance of political party membership for adults. The students were asked, "How important do you think it is for grown-ups to belong to either the Republican or Democratic Party?"[29] The students with participant political orientations would see party membership as very important and those with subject orientations would see membership as not important at all. Again the students in the participant school where the principal had personal control the students rated political party membership as important. The students in the subject schools where the school district rules prevailed, political party membership was seen as not very important.

The variance in student perceptions of the importance of adult membership in political parties was explained by the student's

---

[29] Ibid., question 78.

socio-economic status and the race of the questionnaire administrators in addition to Factor IV, Administrative Structure. The multiple correlation coefficient was .81 with 66% of the variance explained significant at .001. The partial correlations and the levels of significance are as follows:

1.	Factor IV, Administrative Structure	-.62 at .011
2.	Student Socio-Economic Status	-.59 at .016
3.	Race of Interviewer	-.51 at .044

As student socio-economic status rose, the more adult political party membership was perceived as important. There was a similar but weaker relationship between student socio-economic status and student perception of the differences between political parties,[30] with upper socio-economic status students perceiving a greater difference than lower ones with a correlation of .21 significant at .462. Both of these confirm the Greenberg and Hess-Torney research that the higher the student's socio-economic status the more likely he is going to have a participant political orientation.[31]

In addition to organizational climate factors and student socio-economic status, three other variables also significantly explained student perceptions of political parties. These were the proportion of Black students in the class, the race of the questionnaire administrator, and the proportion of boys in the class. For student perceptions of the differences between the Democrats and the Republicans, the multiple correlation coefficient was .75 explaining 56% of the variance with a significance of .002. The partial correlation coefficients and significance levels are as follows:

1.	Proportion of Black Students in Class	-.52 at .034
2.	Proportion of Boys in Class	.60 at .011

The partial correlation coefficients and significance levels of student socio-economic status and race of interviewer in relation to student perceptions of the importance of adult membership in a political party are shown above.

If a class contained a predominance of Black female students whose questionnaire was administered by a Black man, these students perceived more difference between the Democrats and Republicans and felt that political party membership was important for adults. The White male interviewed by a White man saw little differences between the political parties and felt that adult political party membership

---

[30] Ibid., question 43.

[31] Edward S. Greenberg, op. cit., pp. 128, 156, 228, and Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, op. cit., pp. 224-225.

was not important. Thus it would seem that Black female students held the most participant orientations toward political parties and that White males had the most subject orientation. The salience of politics to the students could be explained by factors of the school's organizational climate but orientations toward political parties was explained in small part by the schools' over-all administrative structure and in large part by the student's position in the social structure.

F. SET FIVE - POLITICAL BEHAVIORS

The political behavior of the students was measured by the indices developed by Hess and Torney, the Index of Participation in Political Discussion and the Index of Political Activity.[32] Each index was composed of three questions from the Civic Education Questionnaire that could be answered "Yes" or "No." The questions composing the Index of Participation in Political Discussion are as follows:

1. I have talked with my mother or father about our country's problems.
2. I have talked with my mother or father about a candidate.
3. I have talked with my friends about a candidate.[33]

The questions composing the Index of Political Activity are as follows:

1. I have read about a candidate in newspapers or magazines.
2. I have worn a button for a candidate.
3. I have helped a candidate by doing things for him - such as handing out buttons and papers with his name on them.[34]

The greater the number of "Yes" responses on either index the student was considered to engage in more political discussion and activity. The student with a participant political orientation would engage in more political discussion and activity than the student with a subject orientation.

For each school I computed a mean for each school from the individual student political discussion and activity scores. School differences in political discussion could not be explained by any of

---

[32] Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney, op. cit., Appendix C.

[33] Appendix C, Civic Education Questionnaire, questions 24, 27 and 25.

[34] Ibid., questions 26, 22, and 23.

the organizational climate factors or the control variables, although there is a weak relationship, a correlation of .38 significant at .121, between the class racial proportion and political discussion. As the proportion of Black students increases the amount of political discussion increases, and as the proportion of White students increases, political discussion decreases. This same relationship held for political activity being statistically significant, a correlation of .57 significant at .014. Also none of the organizational climate factors were significantly related to school differences in student political activity.

Thus I would conclude that the organizational climate of the schools has no effect upon the political behavior of the students. Rather it is the racial composition of the school in low socio-economic status elementary schools that is related to student political behavior, with racial segregation having different effects for different races. All-Black schools showing the greatest amount of participant political behavior and all-White schools showing the greatest amount of subject political behavior.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

This exploratory study has revealed that the elementary school organizational climate can influence student political orientations and behavior by two processes. First, the teacher reflecting the organizational climate of the elementary school presents a role model that the student imitates and then transfers this model to political objects. Second, the elementary school organization can present a role model that the student transfers to political objects. My factor analysis of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire revealed four factors of the elementary school organizational climate. Factor II, Leadership Initiation, and Factor III, Source of Social Cohesion, were related to student political orientations and behavior via the teacher as a role model. Factor I, Sense of Organizational Attachment, and Factor IV, Administrative Structure, were related via the school organization as a model. Although the four organizational climate factors could predict the few school differences discussed below, I found that school racial proportions could explain many more school differences in student political orientations and behavior. My research indicates that the elementary school organizational climate has less relationship to student political behavior and orientations than the racial composition of the school.

Two organizational climate factors, Factor II, Leadership Initiation, and Factor III, Source of Social Cohesion, were related to student perceptions of the role model of teachers. But only in the Factor II climate was there a transfer of the teacher role to the political system, Factor III could only explain different student perceptions of teachers' roles. Thus it would seem that when a school organizational climate changes in relation to Factor II, one can expect some changes in student political orientations, but not when the organizational climate changes regarding Factor III.

Factor II, Leadership Initiation, was related to student perceptions of the teachers' influence upon them regarding the teaching of citizenship and the teacher role attribute of infallibility. When a school's organizational climate was Autonomous in that the teachers were allowed much latitude in school decision-making, the students perceived their teacher as teaching them much about being a good citizen and viewed the teacher as making few mistakes. Students apparently transferred this participant view of the teacher in the school organization to the political system by reporting a higher interest in politics. However the students did not transfer their feelings of teacher infallibility to either political authorities or

institutions. When the school's organizational climate was Paternal in that the principal makes all the decisions, the teacher role would be more of a subject in the school organization. The student's caught this by perceiving the teacher as not being very influential in teaching them about citizenship and being fallible. This apparently transferred to the political system in that the students reported a lower interest in politics.

Factor III, Source of Social Cohesion, was only related to student perceptions of the teacher role attributes of benevolence and infallibility but neither of these were transferred to political authorities or institutions. When the teacher felt that he was integrated into the school organization in that his need to belong to a social group was satisfied by being a good teacher, the students perceived their teacher as benevolent and infallible. When the teacher only came to school to socialize with his fellow teachers and that teaching was not the reason he came to school, the students perceived their teacher as less benevolent and more fallible. Since this organizational factor had no relationship to student political orientations and behavior, I would speculate that it might be related to student academic achievement with the benevolent and infallible teacher having students who achieve more. Finally, I noted that Black students were more sensitive to the two organizational climate factors in that they rated the teacher as having more citizenship influence, benevolence, and infallibility than White students in the same organizational climate factor.

Factor I, Sense of Organizational Attachment, and Factor IV, Administrative Structure were related to student perceptions of the role model of their schools. Both factors were related to student political orientations and behaviors. Regarding Factor I, in a school where the teachers felt a sense of attachment to the school, this feeling was apparently picked up by the students who then reported that they felt attached to the American political system. When the teachers reported a low feeling school attachment, the students reported the same for the American political system.

In the Factor IV, Administrative Structure, school where the administrative functions are centralized in the person of the principal, the teachers are more threatened and vulnerable to the principal's authority. Thus the punitive power of the school organization is great and the students show some transference of this to political authorities and institutions. The attributing of benevolence by the students to these authorities and institutions also indicates a feeling of vulnerability. However the impact of this realization of the great punitive power of authority figures and institutions is to increase student interest in politics especially party politics. The school where the administrative structure is decentralized and formal, possibly rigid, the teachers are not threatened nor vulnerable to the principal's authority. This apparently is transferred to political authorities and

institutions. Since no punitive power is perceived the interest in politics and the importance of party politics also declines.

Although I was able to discover some relationship at the elementary school level between the four organizational climate factors and student political orientations and behavior that was independent of the control variables, many of the relationships were weak and only explained a few student orientations and behavior. Thus if one is interested in changing the organizational climate of the low socio-economic status elementary school, one could expect few changes upon the entire student body. However it is possible that certain kinds of students might be more affected by organizational climate factors than others and this should be the focus of future research regarding the influence of school organizational climate factors upon student political orientations and behavior.

The most powerful predictor of the school differences in student political orientations and behavior was the racial composition of the school, holding all other variables constant: race of interviewer, socio-economic status and sex of student, sex of the teacher, and the four organizational climate factors. As can be seen from Table 2-1 practically all the schools were racially segregated, either all-White or all-Black. The political effects of racial segregation was different for each race. The all-Black schools reported political orientations that were non-supportive of the political system and political behavior that was activist, while the all-White schools were supportive in orientations and non-activist in political behavior.

As the proportion of Black students increased in the low socio-economic status elementary schools the feelings of attachment to the American political community decreased, the laws were perceived as ineffective, the policeman was perceived as threatening, authority figures and institutions were seen as fallible and lacking in punitive power. However greater differences were perceived between the Democrats and Republicans and the students in the all-Black schools believed that political party membership was important. This was indicated in their political behavior where they engaged in more political discussion and activity than the students in all-White low socio-economic status elementary schools.

Those students in all-White elementary schools had higher attachment to the American political community, saw laws as effective, did not perceive the policeman as threatening, and authority figures were perceived as infallible and possessing great punitive power. As the elementary school racial composition became more White, the students could not discern differences between the Democrats and Republicans and political party membership was not seen as important. Political discussion and activity was lower than that in all-Black schools.

What all this indicates is that the apparent effect of racial

segregation upon Black students as a group is to increase their politicization and to decrease it for the White students as a group. The over-all effect of segregation appears to be related on activist or participant political orientation for the Black student body and a non-activist or subject political orientation of the White student body of similar low socio-economic status. It would appear that the political effect of racial integration in terms of over-all student body political orientations and behavior is to decrease participant political orientations. As a future research problem I would suggest an examination of the individual effects of racial integration of elementary schools upon the individual student political orientations and behavior. It may well be that the political effect of racial integration is to deactivate low socio-economic status Black political behavior and to activate low socio-economic status White political behavior.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almond, Gabriel A., and Verba, Sidney. The Civic Culture, Princeton: Princeton U.P., 1963.

Andrews, John H. M. "Some Validity Studies of the OCDQ." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, February, 1965, Chicago. Mimeographed.

Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Argyris, Chris. Intervention Theory and Method. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1970.

Argyris, Chris. "Some Problems in Conceptualizing Organizational Climate: A Case Study of a Bank." Administrative Science Quarterly 2 (1958): 501-520.

Bandura, Albert. "Behavior Modification Through Modeling Procedures." Research in Behavior Modification, edited by Leonard Krasner and Leonard Ullman. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.

Brink, William and Harris, Lou. The Negro Revolution in America. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1964.

Broverman, Donald M. "Effects of Score Transformations in Q and R Factor Analysis Techniques." Psychological Review. 68 (1961) 68-80.

Broverman, Donald M. "Normative and Ipsative Measurement in Psychology." Psychological Review. 69 (1962): 295-305.

Brown, Alan F. and House, John H. "The Organizational Component in Education." Review of Educational Research 37 (1967): 399-413.

Clark, Kenneth B. Dark Ghetto. New York: Harper & Row, 1965.

Coleman, James S.; Campbell, Ernest Q.; Hobson, Carol J.; McPartland, James; Mood, Alexander M.; Weinfeld, Frederic D.; and York, Robert L. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: HEW, Office of Education, 1966.

Cornell, Francis G. "Socially Perceptive Administration." The Phi Delta Kappan 36 (1955): 219-223.

Dawson, Richard E., and Prewitt, Kenneth. Political Socialization. Boston: Little Brown, 1969.

Easton, David, and Hess, Robert D. "The Child's Political World." Midwest Journal of Political Science, 6 (1962): 229-246.

Greenberg, Edward S. "Political Socialization to Support of the System: A Comparison of Black and White Children." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1969.

Greenstein, Fred I. Children and Politics. New Haven: Yale, 1965.

Greer, Germaine. The Female Eunuch. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Halpin, Andrew W. Theory and Research in Administration. N.Y.: Macmillan, 1966.

Halpin, Andrew W., and Crofts, Donald B. The Organizational Climate of Schools. Washington, D. C.: HEW, Office of Education, CRP-543, July, 1962.

Herndon, James. The Way It Spozed To Be. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1968.

Herriott, Robert E., and St. John, Nancy Hoyt. Social Class and the Urban School--The Impact of Pupil Background on Teachers and Principals. N. Y.: Wiley, 1966.

Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the Nature of Man. Cleveland: World, 1966.

Hess, Robert D., and Torney, Judith V. The Development of Basic Attitudes and Values Toward Government and Citizenship during the Elementary School Years, Part I. Washington, D.C.: HEW, Office of Education, CRP-1078, 1965.

Hess, Robert D., and Torney, Judith V. The Development of Political Attitudes in Children. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Hirsch, Herbert. Poverty and Politicization. New York: Free Press, 1971.

Holt, John. How Children Fail. New York: Delta, 1964.

Holt, John. How Children Learn. New York: Pitman, 1967.

Katz, Irwin; Robinson, J.M.; Epps, E.G.; and Waly, Patricia. "The Effects of Race of Experimenter and Test Versus Neutral Instructions on Expressions of Hostility." Journal of Social Issues 20 (1964): 54-59.

Kohl, Herbert. 36 Children. New York: New American Library, 1967.

Kozol, Jonathan. Death At An Early Age. New York: Bantam, 1967.

Lavin, David E. The Prediction of Academic Performance. New York: Wiley, 1965.

Likert, Rensis. The Human Organization. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Litt, Edgar. "Civic Education, Community Norms, and Political Indoctrination." American Sociological Review 28 (1963): 69-75.

Perrow, Charles. Complex Organizations. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1972.

Rafter, Mary E., and Ruble, William L. "Stepwise Deletion of Variables from a Least Squares Equation," East Lansing: Michigan State University, Agricultural Experiment Station, STAT Series Description No. 8 LSDEL, 1969.

Rosenthal, Robert, and Jacobson, Lenore. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Rummell, R. J. Applied Factor Analysis. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern U.P., 1970.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in Black and White. New York: Random, 1964.

Tagiuri, Renato, and Litwin, George H., eds. Organizational Climate--Explorations of a Concept. Cambridge: Harvard, 1968.

APPENDIX A

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Full-Time Faculty Member at

I would appreciate your cooperation in completing the enclosed questionna re, it should take you about 15 minutes to complete. DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE. When you have completed the questionnaire, fold it in half, staple it closed, and return it to the school secretary.

The items in this questionnaire describe typical behaviors or conditions that occur within an elementary school organization. Please indicate to what extent each of these descriptions characterizes your school. Please do not evaluate the items in terms of "good" or "bad" behavior, but read each item carefully and respond in terms of how well the statement describes your school.

Printed below is an example of a typical item found in the questionnaire:

1. Teachers call each other by their first names.
    1. Rarely occurs.
    2. Sometimes occurs.
    3. Often occurs.
    4. Very frequently occurs.

In this example the respondent circled (pencil or pen) alternative 3 on the questionnaire to show that the interpersonal relationship described by this item "often occurs" at the school. Of course, any of the other alternatives could be selected, depending upon how often the behavior described by the item does, indeed, occur in your school.

The purpose of this questionnaire is to secure a description of the different ways in which teachers behave and of the various conditions under which they must work. After you have completed the questionnaire, I will examine the behaviors or conditions that have been described as typical by the majority of the teachers in your school. I will construct from this description a portrait of the Organizational Climate of your school which shall be made available to the entire faculty of the school.

PLEASE BE SURE THAT YOU MARK EVERY ITEM.

PLEASE ANSWER THIS QUESTIONNAIRE INDEPENDENTLY OF THE OTHER TEACHERS.

Sincerely yours,

Alfred S. Arkley
Political Science Department
Michigan State University

1-2. School Number

3. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.
   1. Rarely occurs
   2. Sometimes occurs
   3. Often occurs
   4. Very frequently occurs

4. The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying.
   1. Rarely occurs
   2. Sometimes occurs
   3. Often occurs
   4. Very frequently occurs

5. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.
   1. Rarely occurs
   2. Sometimes occurs
   3. Often occurs
   4. Very frequently occurs

6. Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available.
   1. Rarely occurs
   2. Sometimes occurs
   3. Often occurs
   4. Very frequently occurs

7. Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home.
   1. Rarely occurs
   2. Sometimes occurs
   3. Often occurs
   4. Very frequently occurs

8. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority.
   1. Rarely occurs
   2. Sometimes occurs
   3. Often occurs
   4. Very frequently occurs

9. Extra books are available for classroom use.
   1. Rarely occurs
   2. Sometimes occurs
   3. Often occurs
   4. Very frequently occurs

10. Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

11. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

12. Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

13. In faculty meetings, there is the feeling of "let's get things done."
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

14. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

15. Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

16. Teachers seek special favors from the principal.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

17. School supplies are readily available for use in classwork.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

18. Student progress reports require too much work.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

19. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

20. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

21. Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

22. Teachers have too many committee requirements.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

23. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

24. Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

25. Custodial services is available when needed.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

26. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

27. Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

28. Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

29. Teachers at this school show much school spirit.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

30. The principal goes out of his way to help teachers.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

31. The principal helps teachers solve personal problems.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

32. Teachers at this school stay by themselves.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

33. The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

34. The principal sets an example by working hard himself.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

35. The principal does personal favors for teachers.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

36. Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classrooms.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

37. The morale of the teachers is high.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

38. The principal uses constructive criticism.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

39. The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

40. Teachers socialize together in small select groups.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

41. The principal makes all class-scheduling decisions.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

42. Teachers are contacted by the principal each day.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

43. The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

44. The principal helps staff members settle minor differences.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

45. The principal schedules the work for teachers.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

46. Teachers leave the grounds during the school day.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

47. Teachers help select which courses will be taught.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

48. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

49. The principal talks a great deal.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

50. The principal explains his reasons for criticism to teachers.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

51. The principal is in support of better salaries for teachers.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

52. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

53. The rules set by the principal are never questioned.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

54. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

55. School secretarial services is available for teachers' use.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

56. The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business meeting.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

57. The principal is in the building before teachers arrive.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

58. Teachers work together preparing administrative reports.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

59. Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

60. Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

61. The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

62. Teachers talk about leaving the school system.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

63. The principal checks the subject-matter ability of teachers.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

64. The principal is easy to understand.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

65. Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

66. The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity.
    1. Rarely occurs
    2. Sometimes occurs
    3. Often occurs
    4. Very frequently occurs

APPENDIX B

OCDQ QUESTIONS THAT COMPOSE THE EIGHT SUBTESTS
Subtests Relating to the Teachers' Behavior

I. DISENGAGEMENT

4. The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying.
8. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority.
12. Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members.
16. Teachers seek special favors from the principal.
20. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings.
24. Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings.
28. Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings.
32. Teachers at this school stay by themselves.
40. Teachers socialize together in small select groups.
62. Teachers talk about leaving the school system.

II. HINDRANCE

*6. Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available.
*10. Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports.
14. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school.
18. Student progress reports require too much work.
22. Teachers have too many committee requirements.
26. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.

III. ESPRIT

5. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.
9. Extra books are available for classroom use.
13. In faculty meetings, there is the feeling of "let's get things done."
17. School supplies are readily available for use in classwork.
21. Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues.
23. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally.
25. Custodial services is available when needed.
29. Teachers at this school show much school spirit.
33. The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor and pleasure.
37. The morale of the teachers is high.

IV. INTIMACY

3. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.
7. Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home.
11. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members.
15. Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members.
19. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time.
*27. Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves.
58. Teachers work together preparing administrative reports.

*Scored negatively.

Subtests Relating to the Principal's Behavior

V. ALOOFNESS

36. Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classrooms.
42. Teachers are contacted by the principal each day.
46. Teachers leave the grounds during the school day.
53. The rules set by the principal are never questioned.
*55. School secretarial service is available for teachers' use.
56. The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business meeting.
59. Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda.
60. Faculty meeetings are mainly principal-report meetings.
*65. Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit.

VI. PRODUCTION EMPHASIS

41. The principal makes all class scheduling decisions.
45. The principal schedules the work for the teachers.
48. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes.
49. The principal talks a great deal.
52. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously.
63. The principal checks the subject matter ability of teachers.
66. The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity.

VII. THRUST

30. The principal goes out of his way to help teachers.
34. The principal sets an example by working hard himself.
38. The principal uses constructive criticism.
43. The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions.
50. The principal explains his reasons for criticism to teachers.
54. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.
57. The principal is in the building before teachers arrive.
61. The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across.
64. The principal is easy to understand.

VIII. CONSIDERATION

31. The principal helps teachers solve personal problems.
35. The principal does personal favors for teachers.
39. The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work.
44. The principal helps staff members settle minor differences.
47. Teachers help select which courses will be taught.
51. The principal is in support of better salaries for teachers.

*Scored negatively.

APPENDIX C

CIVIC EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Michigan State University

I and another person from Michigan State University are visiting all the 5th grade classes in this school and in other schools in Michigan to ask boys and girls like yourselves to answer the questions on the questionnaire I have given you.

We would like to know what boys and girls think about the things mentioned in the questionnaire. You should understand that this is a questionnaire. It is not a test. You cannot pass or fail. We are only interested in getting your opinion. Because we think when we ask people for their opinions it is important to keep what they say private, your name will not be on the questionnaire. DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

For each question you will circle on the questionnaire the answer you think comes closest to your opinion. Remember there are no right or wrong answers, we only want to know what you think -- what your opinion is.

I will read each question aloud while you read it silently. After each question is read, you should choose your answer and circle the number in front of the answer.

Now turn the page and we will start together with question number 3.

1-2.Class Code.

3. You are a:
   1. Boy
   2. Girl

4. How old are you?
   1. 8 years old or younger
   2. 9 years old
   3. 10 years old
   4. 11 years old
   5. 12 years old or older

5. America is the best country in the world.
   1. YES!! YES!!
   2. yes
   3. no opinion
   4. no
   5. NO!! NO!!

6. What makes you the most proud to be an American?
   1. Americans are the most generous people in the world.
   2. America has beautiful parks and highways.
   3. Americans can vote for their own leaders.
   4. Americans have freedom.
   5. Our President.
   6. Our Black Leaders.

7. Which one of these does the most to keep peace in the world?
   1. United Nations.
   2. United States.
   3. I don't know.

8. Think of the President as he really is...
   1. Would always want to help me if I needed it.
   2. Would almost always want to help me if I needed it.
   3. Would usually want to help me if I needed it.
   4. Would sometimes want to help me if I needed it.
   5. Would seldom want to help me if I needed it.
   6. Would not usually want to help me if I needed it.

9. Think of the President as he really is...
   1. Almost never makes mistakes.
   2. Rarely makes mistakes.
   3. Sometimes makes mistakes.
   4. Often makes mistakes.
   5. Usually makes mistakes.
   6. Almost always makes mistakes.

10. Think of the President as he really is...
   1. Can punish anyone.
   2. Can punish almost anyone.
   3. Can punish many people.
   4. Can punish some people.
   5. Can punish a few people.
   6. Can punish no one.

11. Most laws were made a long time ago.
   1. YES!! YES!!
   2. yes
   3. no opinion
   4. no
   5. NO!! NO!!

12. I don't think people in the government care much what people like my family think.
   1. YES!! YES!!
   2. yes
   3. no opinion
   4. no
   5. NO!! NO!!

13. Voting is the only way that people like my parents can have any say about how the government runs things.
   1. YES!! YES!!
   2. yes
   3. no opinion
   4. no
   5. NO!! NO!!

14. If the President came to your town to give a prize to the grown-up who was the best citizen, which of the following grown-ups would he choose? (Choose one)
    1. Someone who works hard.
    2. Someone who everybody likes.
    3. Someone who votes and gets others to vote.
    4. Someone who helps others.
    5. Someone who is interested in the way our country is run.
    6. Someone who obeys the law.
    7. Someone who goes to church or synagogue.
    8. I don't know what citizen means.

15. Think of Your Mother as she really is...
    1. Would always want to help me if I needed it.
    2. Would almost always want to help me if I needed it.
    3. Would usually want to help me if I needed it.
    4. Would sometimes want to help me if I needed it.
    5. Would seldom want to help me if I needed it.
    6. Would not usually want to help me if I needed it.

16. Think of Your Mother as she really is...
    1. Almost never makes mistakes.
    2. Rarely makes mistakes.
    3. Sometimes makes mistakes.
    4. Often makes mistakes.
    5. Usually makes mistakes.
    6. Almost always makes mistakes.

17. Think of Your Mother as she really is...
    1. Can punish anyone.
    2. Can punish almost anyone.
    3. Can punish many people.
    4. Can punish some people.
    5. Can punish a few people.
    6. Can punish no one.

18. I think that what goes on in the government is all for the best.
    1. YES!! YES!!
    2. yes
    3. no opinion
    4. no
    5. NO!! NO!!

19. How much are you interested in reading or talking about current events, government, or other things going on in our country? (choose one)
    1. Very much
    2. Some
    3. Only a little

20. Disobey means to do something someone tells you not to do. Which of these is the most wrong? (Choose one)
    1. To disobey your mother.
    2. To disobey your teacher.
    3. To disobey your father.
    4. To disobey the policeman.

21. Which do you think is the most true? (Choose one)
    1. People who break laws always get caught.
    2. People who break laws usually get caught.
    3. People who break laws usually get away.
    4. People who break laws always get away.

In reading the next few things, you should know that every four years people run for office in our government, this is called an election; and the people running in it are called candidates. Things about government, politics, and candidates that you have done:

22. I have worn a button for a candidate.
    1. Yes
    2. No

23. I have helped a candidate by doing things for him -- such as handing out buttons and papers with his name on them.
    1. Yes
    2. No

24. I have talked with my mother or father about our country's problems.
    1. Yes
    2. No

25. I have talked with my friends about a candidate.
    1. Yes
    2. No

26. I have read about a candidate in newspapers or magazines.
    1. Yes
    2. No

27. I have talked with my mother or father about a candidate.
    1. Yes
    2. No

28. Choose the sentence which comes closest to telling what your Mother or Guardian's job is.
    1. She stays home most of the time and has no job.
    2. She works in a factory, laundry, restaurant, hotel, or house as a maid or waitress or some other job where she works with her hands.
    3. She works as a saleslady, clerk, or secretary.
       She works in an office or store for somebody else.
       She owns a small store.
       She wears a uniform or nice clothes to work.
    4. She is a teacher, social worker, lawyer, nurse or some job like that.
       She has a college training for her job.
    5. She is looking for a job.
    6. I don't know what my Mother or Guardian does.

29. Choose the sentence which comes closest to telling what your Father or Guardian's job is. (If your Father or Guardian doesn't live at home anymore, circle answer 9)
    1. He works in a factory or mill, or as a truck driver, janitor, or some other job where he works with his hands.
    2. He works with his hands in a job that takes a long time to learn like a carpenter, an electrician, a plumber, a TV repairman, a machinist, etc.
    3. He works in an office or store for somebody else.
       He works as a salesman, clerk, or bookkeeper.
       He owns a service station, laundry, or small store.
       He is a fireman, soldier, policeman, or works for the government.
       He usually wears a uniform or a white shirt and tie to work.
    4. He works in an office as a manager or executive.
    5. He is a doctor, lawyer, teacher, engineer or some job like that.
       He has a college training for his job.
    6. He owns a large business, like a factory or a big store.
    7. He is looking for a job.
    8. I don't know what my Father or Guardian does.
    9. My Father or Guardian doesn't live at home anymore.

30. What happens in the government will happen no matter what the people do. It is like the weather, there is nothing people can do about it.
    1. YES!! YES!!
    2. yes
    3. no opinion
    4. no
    5. NO!! NO!!

31. There are some big powerful men in the government who are running the whole thing and they do not care about us ordinary people.
    1. YES!! YES!!
    2. yes
    3. no opinion
    4. no
    5. NO!! NO!!

32. Think of the Supreme Court as it really is...
    1. Would always want to help me if I needed it.
    2. Would almost always want to help me if I needed it.
    3. Would usually want to help me if I needed it.
    4. Would sometimes want to help me if I needed it.
    5. Would seldom want to help me if I needed it.
    6. Would not usually want to help me if I needed it.

33. Think of the Supreme Court as it really is...
    1. Almost never makes mistakes.
    2. Rarely makes mistakes.
    3. Sometimes makes mistakes.
    4. Often makes mistakes.
    5. Usually makes mistakes.
    6. Almost always makes mistakes.

34. Think of the Supreme Court as it really is...
    1. Can punish anyone.
    2. Can punish almost anyone.
    3. Can punish many people.
    4. Can punish some people.
    5. Can punish a few people.
    6. Can punish no one.

Below are a list of people and things. For each person or thing, choose the sentence that shows how much they teach you about being a good citizen.

35. How much does your mother teach you about being a good citizen?
    1. She teaches me an awful lot.
    2. She teaches me a lot.
    3. She teaches me some.
    4. She teaches me a little.
    5. She doesn't teach me at all.

36. How much does your father teach you about being a good citizen?
    1. He teaches me an awful lot.
    2. He teaches me a lot.
    3. He teaches me some.
    4. He teaches me a little.
    5. He doesn't teach me at all.

37. How much do your friends teach you about being a good citizen?
    1. They teach me an awful lot.
    2. They teach me a lot.
    3. They teach me some.
    4. They teach me a little.
    5. They don't teach me at all.

38. How much does your minister, priest, or rabbi teach you about being a good citizen?
    1. He teaches me an awful lot.
    2. He teaches me a lot.
    3. He teaches me some.
    4. He teaches me a little.
    5. He doesn't teach me at all.

39. How much does television teach you about being a good citizen?
    1. It teaches me an awful lot.
    2. It teaches me a lot.
    3. It teaches me some.
    4. It teaches me a little.
    5. It doesn't teach me at all.

40. How much do books, magazines, and newspapers teach you about being a good citizen?
    1. They teach me an awful lot.
    2. They teach me a lot.
    3. They teach me some.
    4. They teach me a little.
    5. They don't teach me at all.

41. How much does your teacher teach you about being a good citizen?
    1. She teaches me an awful lot.
    2. She teaches me a lot.
    3. She teaches me some.
    4. She teaches me a little.
    5. She doesn't teach me at all.

42. How much difference is there between the Democrats and the Republicans? (Choose one)
    1. A very big difference.
    2. A big difference.
    3. Some difference.
    4. A very small difference.
    5. No difference.
    6. I don't know.

43. If the Democrats and Republicans disagreed on important things: (Choose the sentence that is closest to what you think would happen.)
    1. It would be very bad for the country.
    2. It would be bad for the country.
    3. It would not matter.
    4. It would be good for the country.
    5. It would be very good for the country.
    6. I don't know.

44. Think of Your Teacher as she really is...
    1. Would always want to help me if I needed it.
    2. Would almost always want to help me if I needed it.
    3. Would usually want to help me if I needed it.
    4. Would sometimes want to help me if I needed it.
    5. Would seldom want to help me if I needed it.
    6. Would not usually want to help me if I needed it.

45. Think of Your Teacher as she really is...
    1. Almost never makes mistakes.
    2. Rarely makes mistakes.
    3. Sometimes makes mistakes.
    4. Often makes mistakes.
    5. Usually makes mistakes.
    6. Almost always makes mistakes.

46. Think of Your Teacher as she really is...
    1. Can punish anyone.
    2. Can punish almost anyone.
    3. Can punish many people.
    4. Can punish some people.
    5. Can punish a few people.
    6. Can punish no one.

41. How much does your teacher teach you about being a good citizen?
    1. He teaches me an awful lot.
    2. He teaches me a lot.
    3. He teaches me some.
    4. He teaches me a little.
    5. He doesn't teach me at all.

42. How much difference is there between the Democrats and the Republicans? (Choose one)
    1. A very big difference.
    2. A big difference.
    3. Some difference.
    4. A very small difference.
    5. No difference.
    6. I don't know.

43. If the Democrats and Republicans disagreed on important things: (Choose the sentence that is closest to what you think would happen.)
    1. It would be very bad for the country.
    2. It would be bad for the country.
    3. It would not matter.
    4. It would be good for the country.
    5. It would be very good for the country.
    6. I don't know.

44. Think of Your Teacher as he really is...
    1. Would always want to help me if I needed it.
    2. Would almost always want to help me if I needed it.
    3. Would usually want to help me if I needed it.
    4. Would sometimes want to help me if I needed it.
    5. Would seldom want to help me if I needed it.
    6. Would not usually want to help me if I needed it.

45. Think of Your Teacher as he really is...
    1. Almost never makes mistakes.
    2. Rarely makes mistakes.
    3. Sometimes makes mistakes.
    4. Often makes mistakes.
    5. Usually makes mistakes.
    6. Almost always makes mistakes.

46. Think of Your Teacher as he really is...
    1. Can punish anyone.
    2. Can punish almost anyone.
    3. Can punish many people.
    4. Can punish some people.
    5. Can punish a few people.
    6. Can punish no one.

47. If you could vote, where would be the best place to look for help in making up your mind who to vote for? (Choose one)
    1. A friend my own age.
    2. My father.
    3. My mother.
    4. My mother and father.
    5. My teacher.
    6. My minister, priest, or rabbi.
    7. Television and radio.
    8. Magazines and newspapers.
    9. I would make up my own mind.
    10. I don't know.

48. If the President came to your school to give a prize to the pupil who was the best citizen and the teacher offered him one pupil, which of the following pupils would the teacher pick? (Choose one)
    1. A pupil who helps others.
    2. A pupil who does what he or she is told.
    3. A pupil who gets good grades.
    4. A pupil who is interested in the way our country is run.
    5. A pupil who everybody likes.
    6. A pupil who works hard.
    7. A pupil who goes to church or synagogue.
    8. I don't know what citizen means.

49. All laws are fair.
    1. YES!! YES!!
    2. yes
    3. no opinion
    4. no
    5. NO!! NO!!

50. Do you belong to a school club, organization, or committee (such as student council, musical organization, or service committee)?
    1. Yes
    2. No

51. In this school year I belong to some team (which meets after school hours) which plays baseball, basketball, volleyball, or some other sport.
    1. Yes
    2. No

52. Think of the Policeman as he really is...
    1. Would always want to help me if I needed it.
    2. Would almost always want to help me if I needed it.
    3. Would usually want to help me if I needed it.
    4. Would sometimes want to help me if I needed it.
    5. Would seldom want to help me if I needed it.
    6. Would not usually want to help me if I needed it.

53. Think of the Policeman as he really is...
    1. Almost never makes mistakes.
    2. Rarely makes mistakes.
    3. Sometimes makes mistakes.
    4. Often makes mistakes.
    5. Usually makes mistakes.
    6. Almost always makes mistakes.

54. Think of the Policeman as he really is...
    1. Can punish anyone.
    2. Can punish almost anyone.
    3. Can punish many people.
    4. Can punish some people.
    5. Can punish a few people.
    6. Can punish no one.

What is a democracy? (In each of the following questions, choose one)

55. Is a democracy where the people rule?
    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. I don't know.

56. Is a democracy where no one is very rich or very poor?
    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. I don't know.

57. Is a democracy where all grown-ups can vote?
    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. I don't know.

58. Is a democracy where everyone has an equal chance to get ahead?
    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. I don't know.

59. Is a democracy where you can say anything against the government without getting into trouble?
    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. I don't know.

60. Is a democracy where if most of the people agree, the rest should go along?
    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. I don't know.

61. Think of the Government as it really is...
    1. Would always want to help me if I needed it.
    2. Would almost always want to help me if I needed it.
    3. Would usually want to help me if I needed it.
    4. Would sometimes want to help me if I needed it.
    5. Would seldom want to help me if I needed it.

62. Think of the Government as it really is...
    1. Almost never makes mistakes.
    2. Rarely makes mistakes.
    3. Sometimes makes mistakes.
    4. Often makes mistakes.
    5. Usually makes mistakes.
    6. Almost always makes mistakes.

63. Think of the Government as it really is...
    1. Can punish anyone.
    2. Can punish almost anyone.
    3. Can punish many people.
    4. Can punish some people.
    5. Can punish a few people.
    6. Can punish no one.

64. If you think a policeman is wrong in what he tells you to do, what would you do? (Choose one)
    1. Do what he tells you and forget about it.
    2. Do what he tells you but tell your parents about it.
    3. Do what he tells you but ask the policeman why.
    4. Do what he tells you but tell the policeman he is wrong.

65. Which is the most important for the policeman to do? (Choose one)
    1. Make people obey the law.
    2. Help people who are in trouble.
    3. Catch people who break the law.

66. If you could vote what would you be? (Choose one) (Optional)
    1. A Republican.
    2. A Democrat.
    3. Sometimes a Democrat and sometimes a Republican.
    4. I don't know which I would be.
    5. I don't know what the words Democrat and Republican mean.

67. When I heard Nixon won the election over Humphrey: (mark the one which is closest to the way you felt at that time) (Optional)
    1. I was very happy.
    2. I was happy.
    3. I didn't much care one way or the other.
    4. I felt bad.
    5. I felt so bad I almost cried.

68. (Completed by administrator after the questionnaire was returned.) Race and sex of classroom teacher.
    1. Black Female.
    2. Black Male.
    3. White Female.
    4. White Male.
    5. Team.

If your Father or Guardian doesn't live at home anymore, circle answer 7 for the next three questions.

69. Think of Your Father as he really is...
    1. Would always want to help me if I needed it.
    2. Would almost always want to help me if I needed it.
    3. Would usually want to help me if I needed it.
    4. Would sometimes want to help me if I needed it.
    5. Would seldom want to help me if I needed it.
    6. Would not usually want to help me if I needed it.
    7. My Father or Guardian doesn't live at home anymore.

70. Think of Your Father as he really is...
    1. Almost never makes mistakes.
    2. Rarely makes mistakes.
    3. Sometimes makes mistakes.
    4. Often makes mistakes.
    5. Usually makes mistakes.
    6. Almost always makes mistakes.
    7. My Father or Guardian doesn't live at home anymore.

71. Think of Your Father as he really is...
    1. Can punish anyone.
    2. Can punish almost anyone.
    3. Can punish many people.
    4. Can punish some people.
    5. Can punish a few people.
    6. Can punish no one.
    7. My Father or Guardian doesn't live at home anymore.

72. My family doesn't have any say about what the government does.
    1. YES!! YES!!
    2. yes
    3. no opinion
    4. no
    5. NO!! NO!!

73. Citizens don't have a chance to say what they think about running the government.
    1. YES!! YES!!
    2. yes
    3. no opinion
    4. no opinion
    5. no
    6. NO!! NO!!

74. How much did you learn from the last election for President? (choose one)
    1. I learned a lot.
    2. I learned some.
    3. I learned very little.

75. Which of the following is the best citizen? Choose the sentence that describes the best citizen.
    1. He makes up his mind to be either a Democrat or a Republican and always votes the way his party does.
    2. He doesn't join either the Democrats or the Republicans and votes for the man he thinks is best.
    3. I don't know what the words Democrat and Republican mean.

76. It is better if young people belong to the same political party as their parents. (Choose one)
    1. Yes
    2. No
    3. I don't know.

77. When should a person decide which political party to support?
    1. Before he goes to high school.
    2. Before he leaves high school.
    3. After high school but before he is old enough to vote.
    4. After he is old enough to vote.

78. How important do you think it is for grown-ups to belong to either the Republican or Democratic Party? (Choose one)
    1. Very important.
    2. Important.
    3. Not too important.
    4. Not important at all.
    5. I don't know.

79. Who makes the laws? Choose the one who does most to make laws.
    1. Congress
    2. President
    3. Supreme Court
    4. I don't know.

80. (Completed by the administrator after the questionnaire was returned.)
    Racial-Ethnic membership of student.
    1. Black
    2. White
    3. Chicano
    4. Oriental